

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1.0-1
2.0 INTRODUCTION.....	2.0-1
3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	3.0-1
4.0 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES.....	4.0-1
4.1 AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES.....	4.1-1
4.2 AIR QUALITY.....	4.2-1
4.3 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	4.3-1
4.4 LAND USE AND PLANNING.....	4.4-1
4.5 NATIONAL POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM.....	4.5-1
4.6 TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION AND PARKING.....	4.6-1
5.0 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS.....	5.0-1
6.0 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES.....	6.0-1
7.0 GROWTH INDUCING AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS.....	7.0-1
8.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES.....	8.0-1
9.0 CONTACTS, PREPARERS AND REFERENCES .....	9.0-1

## APPENDICES

<b>Appendix A</b>	Mitigation Monitoring Program
<b>Appendix B</b>	Notice of Preparation, Initial Study, Scoping Meeting Notice
<b>Appendix C</b>	Notice of Preparation Comments
<b>Appendix D</b>	State Lands Commission Agreement
<b>Appendix E</b>	Air Quality Analysis
<b>Appendix F</b>	Phase I and II Environmental Assessments
<b>Appendix G</b>	Traffic and Parking Impact Study

## **SECTION 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1.1 Introduction**

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15123, the following is a brief project summary identifying each significant effect associated with project implementation and any proposed mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce or avoid those effects; areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public; and issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.

### **1.2 Project Background**

The project site is located on a vacant lot (285 Bay Street), totaling approximately 0.35 acres (15,382 square feet), on the east side of Cedar Avenue between Seaside Way and Bay Street. This site is in the northwestern portion of the Pike at Rainbow Harbor commercial development complex. The project site is approximately one block south of Ocean Boulevard, one-half mile east of the Los Angeles River, and four miles south of the Long Beach Airport.

LodgeWorks, the project applicant, proposes to construct a Sierra Suites Hotel (hereinafter referred to as the Sierra Hotel project) in the Pike at Rainbow Harbor (formerly known as the Queensway Bay Master Plan project). Project implementation will involve construction of an 91,304 square foot, seven story hotel structure with 140 rooms (both traditional one-room lodging spaces and enlarged “boutique” suites), meeting facilities, public areas, and a roof top swimming pool and fitness center. Parking for this project will be provided by the existing multi-level parking structure located across the street at the southwest corner of Cedar Avenue and south of Seaside Way.

### **1.3 Identified Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

The following provides a summarized version of all potential impacts from implementation of the proposed Sierra Hotel project that the Initial Study determined could exceed the established significance threshold and the accompanying mitigation measure which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Environmental effects found not to be significant are provided in Section 4.0-3 of this Supplemental EIR.

## Aesthetics

Impact: The project could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Mitigation Measures:

### **Mitigation Measure 4.1.1: Exterior Building Materials**

Prior to the approval of any building permits, the applicant shall submit plans and specifications for all exterior materials to both the Department of Planning and Building and the Department of Public Works for review and approval to ensure that no exterior building materials or window glass treatments would create uncomfortable light or glare impacts to any public or private roadways or surrounding property improvements. No glass shall be permitted to have a reflectivity greater than 15% without submittal of a reflective glare study for the review and approval by both the Director of Planning and Building and the Director of Public Works. No exterior building surface shall consist of any reflective metallic surfaces.

### **Mitigation Measure 4.1.2: Exterior Lighting**

Prior to the approval of any building permits, the applicant shall submit plans and specifications for all exterior lighting fixtures and light standards to both the Department of Planning and Building and the Department of Public Works for review and approval to ensure incorporation of glare control visors and shields. The submitted plans and specifications shall include a photometric design study verifying no significant lighting spillover to any public or private roadways or surrounding properties.

## Air Quality

Impact: Although not identified as a potentially significant Impact in the Initial Study, project construction could result in short term dispersion of dust in and around the project site.

Mitigation Measure:

### **Mitigation Measure 4.2.1: Dust Control**

All project construction activities shall conform to Rule 403 of the South Coast Air Quality Management District on Fugitive Dust.

## Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact: Although Initial Study did not consider soil contamination to be a potentially significant impact and the Phase I and Phase II assessments found no evidence of soil contamination, there remains a remote possibility of discovering contaminated soil during project excavation and grading activities.

Mitigation Measure:

### **Mitigation Measure 4.3.1: Soil Contamination**

- . If during construction of the project, soil contamination is suspected, construction in the area should stop and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented. If it is determined that contaminated soils exist, the draft EIR should identify how any required investigation and/or remediation will be conducted, and which government agency will provide regulatory oversight.

## Land Use and Planning

Impact: The project could conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Mitigation Measure:

### **Mitigation Measure 4.4.1: Tidelands Trust Status**

- . In accordance with the existing Queensway Bay Exchange Agreement, the City shall allow the Sierra Hotel project site property to revert back to its status as Tidelands public trust land and request the State Lands Commission to make a determination whether the proposed Sierra Hotel project is a land use consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine.

## National Pollution Discharge Elimination system (NPDES)

Impact: The project would involve the loss of pervious surface, which could result in significant pollutant discharge impacts if not properly mitigated.

## Mitigation Measures:

### **Mitigation Measure 4.5.1: SWPPP and Monitoring Plan**

Prior to commencement of any soil disturbing activities, the applicant shall submit for approval to the RWQCB a Notice of Intent and shall prepare a SWPPP and monitoring plan for BMP implementation at MEP standards as applicable under current regulations.

### **Mitigation Measure 4.5.2: SUSMP Plan**

The applicant shall submit for City review and approval a SUSMP to reduce and eliminate post-construction storm water runoff to MEP standards. The SUSMP shall include structural BMPs for the hotel and courtyard addressing urban runoff from the project site, including post-construction structural or treatment control BMPs designed to mitigate (infiltrate or treat) the volume of runoff produced from a 0.75 inch storm event prior to runoff discharge into a storm water conveyance system. The SUSMP shall also include provisions for storm drain stenciling and signage, proper designation of outdoor material storage areas (as applicable), and proof of ongoing BMP maintenance such as after-storm site cleaning.

### **Mitigation Measure 4.5.3: Best Management Practices**

All project construction activities shall be in full compliance with the federal NPDES program and Chapter 18.95 of the Long Beach Municipal Code (including all applicable requirements of Section 18.95.050). At a minimum, project construction shall include the following activities:

- a. Sediment for areas disturbed by construction shall be retained on-site using structural controls such as sandbags or fencing.
- b. Stockpiles of soil shall be properly contained to eliminate or reduce sediment transport from the project site to streets, drainage facilities or adjacent properties.
- c. Appropriate BMPs for construction-related materials, wastes, spills or residues shall be implemented to minimize transport to streets, drainage facilities or adjacent properties.
- d. All wastewater on the project site resulting from construction activities shall be pumped and removed to an appropriate disposal facility in accordance with NPDES requirements.
- e. Runoff from equipment and vehicle washing shall be contained on-site unless treated to reduce or remove sediment and other pollutants.
- f. All construction debris and waste materials shall be collected and properly disposed in trash containers or recycle bins.

- g. All streets and alleys in the project site vicinity used by project construction vehicles shall be dry swept to minimize mud, along with all applicable NPDES requirements for pollutant reduction techniques when flushing paved surfaces.

#### **1.4 Areas of Known Controversy**

There are no areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency at the start of the Draft Supplemental EIR public circulation and review period. No issues of controversy have been raised by the public at this time. If any issues of potential controversy are raised during the Draft Supplemental EIR public review period, the issues discussion and potential impact analysis will be added to this document as a response to comments pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 prior to certification of the Final Supplemental EIR by the Lead Agency.

#### **1.5 Issues to be Resolved**

Potential areas of controversy and issues to be resolved by the decision-makers include those areas where an unavoidable significant impact has been projected as well as issue areas, where concerns have been raised, primarily through the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Draft Supplemental EIR review process, indicating a level of controversy, or involving a choice among alternatives

Based on the project environmental analysis contained in Sections 4.0 through 4.6 of this Supplemental EIR, there are no unresolved issues involving an unavoidable significant impact since all identified potential impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level. As noted above in Section 1.4, there are no areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency at the time of public circulation for the Draft Supplemental EIR. The consideration of project alternatives is discussed in Section 8.0 of this document, which concludes that the original environmental alternatives analysis contained in EIR 13-94 was adequate for the entire Queensway Bay/Pike at Rainbow Harbor project, and the minor land use change from a large screen format theater to the proposed Sierra Hotel analyzed under this Supplemental EIR does not require further review of the project alternatives.

## **SECTION 2.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **2.1 Project Summary**

LodgeWorks, the project applicant, proposes to construct a Sierra Suites Hotel (hereinafter referred to as the Sierra Hotel project) in the Pike at Rainbow Harbor commercial entertainment complex. The project site is located at a currently vacant development pad approximately 15,382 square feet in area (285 Bay Street), specifically at the east side of Cedar Avenue between Seaside Way and Bay Street (see Figure 2-1 Vicinity Map and Figure 2-2 Project Map). Project implementation will involve construction of an 91,304 square foot, seven story hotel structure with 140 rooms, meeting facilities, public areas, and a roof top swimming pool and spa center. This hotel is intended to offer upscale accommodations with distinct room and public area appointments, providing both traditional one-room lodging spaces and enlarged “boutique” suites. Parking for this hotel will be provided by the existing multi-level parking structure located on the southwest corner of Cedar Avenue and Seaside Way directly across Cedar Avenue from this development pad.

Since the project is located within the City of Long Beach, the City of Long Beach has the responsibility for carrying out or approving this project. The City of Long Beach will therefore be the Lead Agency for this project with the responsibility for preparing the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) documentation as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Questions regarding the preparation of this document and the City of Long Beach review of this project should be referred to the following person:

City of Long Beach  
Department of Planning and Building  
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Long Beach, CA 90802  
Attention: Craig Chalfant, Project Manager  
(562) 570-6368

### **2.2 Purpose, Type and Intended Uses of this EIR**

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21002.1, the intended use of this EIR is to identify the potentially significant environmental effects (impacts) resulting from implementation of the project, identify alternatives to the project, and indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided. This EIR is also intended as an informative document by other public agencies in connection with any approvals or permits necessary for the

construction and operation of the project. The contents of this EIR are consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21100, which requires EIRs to include a detailed statement setting forth all of the following:

1. All significant effects on the environment of the proposed project;
2. A separate section identifying any significant effects on the environment that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented and any significant effects on the environment that would be irreversible if the project is implemented;
3. Mitigation measures proposed to minimize the significant effects on the environment, including but not limited to measures to reduce the wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy;
4. Alternative to the proposed project; and
5. The growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project.

In addition, the EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons for determining that various effects on the environment of a project are not significant and consequently have not been discussed in detail in the EIR. Any significant effects on the environment shall be limited to substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse changes in the physical conditions which exist in the area as defined in Section 21060.5. CEQA permits the use of previously approved land use documents, including but limited to general plans, specific plans, and local coastal plans in the cumulative impact analysis.

This project is considered to be a part of a larger commercial project presently known as the Pike at Rainbow Harbor, which was previously known as the Queensway Bay Master Plan project. A previous EIR was prepared for the original Queensway Bay project (EIR No. 13-94, State Clearinghouse Number 94081033) and certified by the Long Beach Planning Commission on December 19, 1994. A Mitigated Negative Declaration (ND 5-98) was prepared for a scaled down revision of the Queensway Bay project and certified by the Long Beach Planning Commission on April 2, 1998.

This document is intended as a Supplemental EIR to the previous environmental review on the entire Queensway Bay/Pike at Rainbow Harbor commercial development and incorporates both EIR No. 13-94 and ND 5-98 by reference in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15150. The Lead Agency may choose to prepare a Supplemental EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15163 if only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised. The Sierra Hotel project represents a minor revision to the previously approved Pike project by proposing a hotel land use in the portion of this commercial complex previously intended to accommodate a large screen format theater. A detailed discussion of this land use change is provided in Section 4.4 of this document. Although hotel land uses were part of the overall project reviewed in both the 1994 EIR and 1998 Negative Declaration, no hotel land uses have been established in the Pike complex to date. Pursuant



to CEQA Guidelines Section 15163(e), the decision-making body shall consider the previous EIR as revised by the Supplemental EIR in deciding whether to approve the Sierra Hotel project.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a Draft Supplemental EIR on this project was circulated by the City of Long Beach for a 30 day review period in accordance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, which began on November 18, 2004 and ended on December 17, 2004. This NOP was based on an Initial Study which determined that implementation of the project could result in potentially significant impacts to the environment. Copies of the NOP and Initial Study are provided in Appendix B of this document. All written comments received during the 30 day public comment period are provided in Appendix C.

## **2.3 Format of the EIR**

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15120(c), this Draft Supplemental EIR contains the information and impact analysis required by Sections 15122 through 15131. The format for this Supplemental EIR is described below.

### **Section 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This Section contains an Executive Summary of the project description and all environmental issue analysis (Sections 4.0 through 4.6), listing all significant project impacts, mitigation measures recommended to reduce any significant impacts, and the level of significance after mitigation.

### **Section 2.0 INTRODUCTION**

This Section contains a brief project summary, a discussion of the purpose and intended use of this Supplemental EIR, a brief discussion of the Notice of Preparation (NOP), areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency (including issues raised by the public), and documents incorporated by reference.

### **Section 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This Section provides a description of the development history of the Queensway Bay/Pike at Rainbow Harbor project, a summary of chronological events in this development history, a description of the previous environmental documents certified for this project (EIR 13-94 and ND 5-98) and a description of the Sierra Hotel project proposal for the Pike at Rainbow Harbor development.

### **Section 4.0 ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

This Section discusses the Notice of Preparation (NOP) circulation process, lists all written comments received by the Lead Agency in response to the NOP

circulation, summarizes the Initial Study Checklist findings that were distributed with the NOP, identifies all environmental factor significance thresholds in which the proposed Sierra Hotel project could result in either a Potentially Significant Impact or a Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation, and provides a discussion of the Effects Not Found To Be Significant for each environmental factor.

#### Sections 4.1 through 4.6

These Sections provide an analysis of the Sierra Hotel project's potential environmental impacts for Aesthetics (4.1), Air Quality (4.2), Hazards and Hazardous Materials (4.3), Land Use and Planning (4.4), National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (4.5), and Traffic, Circulation and Parking (4.6).

For each environmental factor, an Existing Conditions discussion is provided pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 to describe the current physical environmental setting on the project site and the project vicinity as these conditions pertain to the environmental issues. The potential project impacts are then identified in relation to the significance thresholds set forth in the Initial Study and analyzed for level of significance in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2. When appropriate, mitigation measures are identified and the level of impact significance after mitigation is discussed pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4.

#### Section 5.0 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

This Section identifies any adverse environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b).

#### Section 6.0 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c), this Section discusses the use of nonrenewable resources and irretrievable commitments of resources should the proposed Sierra Hotel project be implemented as part of the overall Pike project.

#### Section 7.0 GROWTH INDUCING AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

This Section discusses ways in which the Pike development as revised by this Sierra Hotel project could foster economic or population growth, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d). This Section also discusses cumulatively considerable impacts as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15130. Since this is a Supplemental EIR, only the new cumulatively considerable impacts resulting from the Sierra Hotel project need be considered. All other cumulative impacts have already been fully

discussed and considered in the previous 1994 EIR (EIR 13-94) and 1998 Negative Declaration (ND 5-98).

## Section 8.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this Section describes a reasonable range of project alternatives that could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives but avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant project impacts. Since this is a Supplemental EIR for a small component (Sierra Hotel project) of the overall Queensway Bay/Pike at Rainbow Harbor project previously subject to separate environmental reviews documented in EIR 13-94 and ND 5-98, this Section will briefly discuss the project alternatives previously analyzed and address the need for additional alternatives.

## Section 9.0 CONTACTS, PREPARERS AND REFERENCES

This Section identifies all organizations and persons contacted during preparation of this Draft Supplemental EIR, the EIR preparers and technical report authors, and all references used in this Draft Supplemental EIR.

## APPENDICES

Appendix A provides the Mitigation Monitoring Program, setting forth all mitigation measures recommended in the Supplemental EIR along with the project monitoring phase, enforcement agency and monitoring agency for each mitigation measure.

Appendix B contains a copy of the Notice of Preparation (NOP), the Initial Study Checklist distributed with the NOP, and the Scoping Meeting Notice.

Appendix C includes all written comments received in response to the NOP public circulation.

Appendix D provides a copy of the Agreement between the City of Long Beach and the State Lands Commission, along with Exhibit O of this Agreement, used in the Land Use and Planning analysis for Section 4.4 of this Supplemental EIR.

Appendix E provides the air quality analysis performed in accordance with the Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) standards, using the SCAQMD approved URBEMIS 2002 Model. The results of this Model are included in the air quality analysis for Section 4.2 of this Supplemental EIR.

Appendix F provides copies of the Phase I and Phase II Assessments on potential soil and groundwater contamination. The results and recommendations of these assessments are included in Section 4.3 of this Supplemental EIR.

Appendix G provides the Traffic and Parking Impact Study. The findings and recommendations of this study are included in Section 4.6 of this Supplemental EIR.

## **2.4 Areas of Known Controversy**

There are no areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency at the start of the Draft Supplemental EIR public circulation and review period. No issues of controversy have been raised by the public at this time. If any issues of potential controversy are raised during the Draft Supplemental EIR public review period, the issues discussion and potential impact analysis will be added to this document as a response to comments pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 prior to certification of the Final Supplemental EIR by the Lead Agency.

## **2.5 Incorporation by Reference**

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, this Draft Supplemental EIR references documents that have been incorporated by reference, principally the original EIR for the Queensway Bay Master Plan project (EIR 13-94, State Clearinghouse No. 94081033) and the Mitigated Negative Declaration (ND 5-98) for the reduced Queensway Bay project. This EIR represents a supplement to the previous project environmental review documentation. Copies of all documents incorporated by reference, including EIR 13-94 and ND 5-98, are available for public review at the Long Beach City Hall address listed in Chapter 1.1 of this document. Other technical studies and background materials analyzed under this environmental review process have been included in the Appendices for this Supplemental EIR.





## **SECTION 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposed Sierra Hotel project, would construct a seven story, 140 room hotel structure totaling 91,304 square feet on a vacant 15,382 square foot (0.35 acre) development pad located on the east side of Cedar Avenue between Seaside Way and Bay Street.

### **3.1 Queensway Bay/Pike at Rainbow Harbor Development History**

Historically, the Sierra Hotel project development pad and immediate surrounding areas were part of a public beach and privately operated entertainment enterprise known as the Pike Amusement Park. Beginning in the 1950s and through the early 1960s, the City of Long Beach filled over 100 acres of waterfront area, moving the shoreline further south from Ocean Boulevard.

All of the land south of Seaside Way was created in the 1960s from fill materials and is considered public trust land (Tidelands). The State Lands Commission has been vested with jurisdiction over the public trust Tidelands. The City of Long Beach is considered a trustee of this Tidelands area for the State of California. A line which approximates the alignment of Seaside Way demarks the boundary between the tidelands and uplands areas, known as the "Chapter 138 Line" in reference to the California Statute Section (Chapter 138 of the Statutes of 1964) that formed the basis for the Tidelands Trust agreement between the City of Long Beach and the State of California (Local Coastal Program, page III-DS-3). The Sierra Hotel project site is within the Tidelands Trust area and has been subject to the terms and provisions of this Trust. Further discussion on the Tidelands status of this development pad is provided in Section 4.4, Land Use and Planning, of this Supplemental EIR.

The Sierra Hotel project development pad represents a small component of a retail and entertainment complex known as the Pike at Rainbow Harbor, originally known as the Queensway Bay Master Plan project. This entire commercial complex includes the properties between Seaside Way and Shoreline Drive (excluding the Convention Center, Hyatt Hotel and Shoreline Lagoon properties), all areas between Shoreline Drive and the downtown harbor, and the Port areas abutting the southern portion of the downtown harbor (which includes the area surrounding the Queensway Bay Bridge east to the Queen Mary). The previous environmental review documents prepared for the entire complex are discussed in Section 3.2 of this Supplemental EIR and incorporated by reference. The following is a historic chronology of events and approval actions for the Queensway Bay/Pike at Rainbow Harbor project.

**Table 3-1**  
**Chronological Events for Queensway Bay/Pike Development Proposal**

12/19/94	The Long Beach Planning Commission certifies the Environmental Impact Report (EIR No. E-13-94, State Clearinghouse No. 94081033) for the Queensway Bay Master Plan project to develop over 1,720,000 square feet of retail, entertainment, mixed use, office, aquarium and hotel land uses (see Tables 3.0-1 and 3.0-2 of EIR 13-94 for a complete breakdown of all existing and proposed land uses). Three separate hotel/inn structures are proposed for this project, totaling 950 rooms.
3/2/95	The Long Beach Planning Commission recommends the City Council amend zoning district PD-6 (the Downtown Shoreline Planned Development District) for consistency with the Queensway Bay Master Plan project.
3/7/95	The Long Beach City Council approves amendment of PD-6, consistent with the Queensway Bay Master Plan.
5/10/95	The California Coastal Commission approves amendment of PD-6 and the Queensway Bay Master Plan as an amendment to the City's Local Coastal Program, subject to minor modifications.
5/23/95	The City Council adopts amendments to PD-6, incorporating modifications approved by the Coastal Commission.
4/29/97	After a nationwide search that began in August 1996, the City Council selects Oliver McMillan as the designated Queensway Bay project developer.
1/20/98	Oliver McMillan files for Conceptual Site Plan Review approval and begins preparation of a Negative Declaration. This Conceptual Site Plan proposed a large format (IMAX) theater in Subarea 6 (known as the Downtown Harbor portion of the PD-6 zoning district) and a multi-screen movie theater in Subarea 5 (the Tidelands portion of PD-6, which includes the proposed Sierra Hotel project development pad). This Conceptual Site Plan is modified over the next several months to place both the IMAX theater and multi-screen movie theater in Subarea 5.
4/2/98	The Planning Commission certifies the Mitigated Negative Declaration (ND 5-98) and recommends the City Council approve amendments to PD-6 and the City's Local Coastal Program in accordance with the submitted Conceptual Site Plan. The amendments would permit a total of 525,000 square feet of



- entertainment and retail commercial land uses and decrease the total number of hotel/inn rooms in the project from 950 rooms to 275 rooms (Case No. 9801-23).
- 4/14/98 The City Council adopts the Resolutions and Ordinances necessary to approval the PD-6 and Local Coastal Program amendments.
- 6/18/98 The Planning Commission recommends the City Council approve minor amendments to the Local Coastal Program, allowing increased building heights to accommodate a multi-screen movie theater and large format (IMAX) theater.
- 7/14/98 The City Council adopts the amendments recommended by the Planning Commission.
- 8/28/98 The City Council approves a ground lease for Oliver McMillan (developer) to construct approximately 500,000 square feet of entertainment and retail land uses in Subareas 5 and 6 of PD-6.
- 2/3/99 The Coastal Commission approves Coastal Development Permit No. 5-98-156 for the Queensway Bay project in concept subject to conditions.
- 9/16/99 The Planning Commission approves expansion of the project parking structure from 1,500 to 2,200 parking spaces (Case No. 9807-19).
- 11/99-1/01 The Coastal Commission approves five amendments to the Coastal Development Permit for the Queensway Bay project, involving expansion of the parking structure, inclusion of a surface parking lot, converting Paseo Walk from a pedestrian-only to a vehicular street, modifying project designs, and allowing the phasing of development.
- 4/26/01 The Coastal Commission issues Coastal Development Permit No. 5-98-156 for the Queensway Bay project.
- 7/19/01 The Planning Commission approves a revised Site Plan for Building F (Case No. 0106-22).
- 12/20/01 The Planning Commission approves a revised Site Plan in concept for Buildings G, H and J (Case No. 0111-11).
- 4/10/02 The City's Site Plan Review Committee approves Site Plan Review to permit increased restaurant areas in Buildings K, L and M (Case No. 0203-13). The project developer is now Developers Diversified

Realty (DDR) and the project is renamed to the Pike at Rainbow Harbor.

- 3/22/04      The Site Plan Review Committee approves Site Plan Review for a one-story restaurant in Building H1 (Case No. 0403-10).
- 10/18/04     The Site Plan Review Committee approves Site Plan Review and an exterior Sign Program for a new two-story restaurant in Building P (Case No. 0308-24).

### **3.2 Previous Environmental Review Documents**

#### **1994 EIR (EIR 13-94)**

An Environmental Impact Report for the Queensway Bay Master Plan project (EIR No. E-13-94, State Clearinghouse No. 94081033) was certified by the Long Beach Planning Commission on December 19, 1994 and is incorporated by reference to this Supplemental EIR. Project land uses originally proposed for the entire Queensway Bay project area are provided on pages 3.0-2 and 3.0-3 of the 1994 EIR and summarized as follows:

**Table 3-2**  
**1994 Queensway Bay Master Plan – Project Summary**

#### **GENERAL COMMERCIAL**

Retail/Restaurant/Entertainment: 199,000 square feet  
Special Format Theaters/Nighttime Entertainment: 125,000 square feet  
Office: 345,000 square feet

#### **LODGING**

Tidelands Hotel: 300 rooms  
Tidelands Inn: 150 rooms  
North Shore Convention Hotel: 500 rooms with 500 parking spaces

#### **EDUCATIONAL**

Aquarium: 150,000 square feet  
Museum: 16,000 square feet

#### **PARK/RECREATION**

Mitigation Park: 6.79 acres  
Harbor Park: 15.29 acres (existing)  
Special Events Park: 12.5 acres  
Sports Center/Outdoor Space: 70,000 square feet

**HARBOR RELATED**

Harbor Terminal: 10,000 square feet

Harbor Vessels: 50 vessels

Marina: 478 boat slips

Public Boat Launch: 2 ramps to replace existing ramps

Esplanade and public pier: 5.94 acres

**PARKING**

Tidelands Parking Structures: 850 spaces

Structured Fee Parking: 1,200 spaces

New Catalina Structured Parking: 1,700 spaces

New Shoreline Village Structured Parking: 600 spaces

The 1994 EIR broke down the entire Queensway Bay Master Plan project area into four major Subareas: the Tidelands (not to be confused with the Tidelands Trust land that includes the entire Queensway Bay Master Plan area), North Shore, Downtown Harbor, and South Harbor. The Tidelands, North Shore and Downtown Harbor are all located inland north of the harbor and the South Harbor Subarea is located in the Port area, south of the harbor. The proposed land uses are provided by Subarea in Tables 3.0-1 and 3.0-2 of the 1994 EIR.

The Sierra Hotel project development pad is located within the T1 block of the Tidelands Subarea. The T1 block is bounded by Seaside Way to the north, Aquarium Way to the east, Shoreline Drive to the south, and Chestnut Avenue to the west. As shown on Table 3.0-2 of the 1994 EIR, the T1 block was originally proposed to have a 300 room hotel (Tidelands Hotel) and a 700 space parking structure. The entire Tidelands Subarea (T1 and T2 blocks) was planned for a 300 room hotel, a 150 room inn, 140,000 square feet of retail/entertainment space, 95,000 square feet of office space, and 850 parking spaces.

In May 1995, the California Coastal Commission certified the Queensway Bay Development Plan as an amendment to the City's Local Coastal Program, originally adopted by the Long Beach City Council and certified by the Coastal Commission in 1980.

**1998 Negative Declaration (ND 5-98)**

In 1998, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (ND 5-98) was prepared for a reduced Queensway Bay project that proposed 525,000 square feet of entertainment/specialty retail commercial space and a 275 room hotel. The 275 room hotel proposal represented a decrease from the total proposed 950 hotel/inn rooms (300 hotel rooms for the Tidelands T1 block, 150 inn rooms for the Tidelands T2 block, and 500 hotel rooms for the North Shore Subarea) originally analyzed in the 1994 EIR. The Tidelands portion of the 1998 Queensway Bay project proposed 327,000 square feet of total commercial

development, including the 275 room hotel and a 100,000 square foot movie theater, (see page 4 of this Mitigated Negative Declaration) as shown below:

**Table 3-3**  
**1998 Queensway Bay – Project Summary**

**Tidelands Area**

**RETAIL**

Books: 15,000 square feet  
Records: 15,000 square feet  
Retail-Major: 40,000 square feet  
Retail-Shops: 50,000 square feet

**RESTAURANT**

Food Court: 8,400 square feet  
Food Specialty: 6,000 square feet  
Restaurants: 18,000 square feet

**ENTERTAINMENT**

AMC Movie Theater: 100,000 square feet  
Gameworks: 35,000 square feet  
Seasonal: 10,000 square feet

**LODGING**

Hotel: 275 rooms

**Waterfront Area**

**RETAIL**

Retail - General: 50,000 square feet  
Retail - Specialty: 10,000 square feet  
Hand Goods: 12,000 square feet  
Novelty/Kiosk: 7,000 square feet

**RESTAURANT**

Restaurants: 50,000 square feet  
Food - Convenience: 10,000 square feet  
Food - Specialty: 10,000 square feet

**ENTERTAINMENT**

IMAX: 24,000 square feet

## **OFFICE**

Tourist Office: 25,000 square feet

### **3.3 Existing Pike at Rainbow Harbor**

According to the property owner (Developers Diversified Realty), as of March 2005 the Pike at Rainbow Harbor totals 362,237 square feet of gross building floor area (which includes 317,768 square feet of gross leasable building floor area) and 10,782 square feet of outdoor patio area. In addition, the Pike development currently has four vacant building pads (including the Sierra Hotel project site) totaling 51,524 square feet of lot area and a seven level, 2,211 space parking garage located between Seaside Way and Shoreline Drive on the west side of Cedar Avenue. The new Pike land uses include several restaurants and entertainment venues.

The T1 block of the Tidelands Subarea portion of the Pike development has been improved with the 2,211 space parking structure, 41,065 square feet of gross floor area (which includes 32,075 square feet of gross leasable restaurant/retail floor area), and 2,020 square feet of outdoor patio area.

At present, there are no hotel land uses in the entire Pike at Rainbow Harbor development. The Sierra Hotel project site is one of four remaining vacant development pads. The other vacant pads are as follows: Pad E1, located east of Cedar Avenue between Bay Street and Shoreline Drive (directly south of the Sierra Hotel pad, also in the T1 block); Pad G1, located by the southeast corner of Shoreline Drive and Aquarium Way; and Pad P, located by the southeast corner of Shoreline Drive and South Pine Avenue.

### **3.4 Sierra Hotel Project Description**

The Sierra Hotel project analyzed in this Supplemental EIR is for the construction and operation of an 91,304 square foot seven story, 140 room hotel building on a currently vacant lot located on the east side of Cedar Avenue between Seaside Way and Bay Street. Project improvements include an outdoor courtyard area fronting Seaside Way, first floor meeting and exercise rooms, and a rooftop pool and fitness center. Parking will be provided by the existing multi-level parking garage located directly across Cedar Avenue from the project site.

The exterior building design is characterized by a series of vertical recesses highlighted by alternating earth tone colors with horizontal and vertical accent lines throughout the facade surface. This hotel is intended to offer upscale

accommodations with distinct room and public area appointments, providing both traditional one-room lodging spaces and enlarged “boutique” suites.

Figure 3-1 provides the Sierra Hotel project’s regional vicinity and the Sierra Hotel Site Plan is shown in Figure 3-2. The project floor plans are displayed in Figure 3-3 (First Floor Plan), Figure 3-4 (Typical Floor Plans for floors 2-7) and Figure 3-5 (Rooftop/Pool Deck Plan). Project Elevations are shown in Figures 3-6 through 3-8, depicting the Bay Street Elevation, Cedar Avenue Elevation and Seaside Way Elevation, respectively. A more three-dimensional perspective of the Sierra Hotel structure from the corner of Bay Street and Cedar Avenue is shown in Figure 3-9.

The existing Pike at Rainbow Harbor development is shown in Figure 3-10. As discussed above, Pads A1 (the Sierra Hotel project site), E1, G1 and P are currently unimproved vacant sites. The square footages for these four vacant pads in the Figure 3-10 index refer to the total pad area. The square footages of all other development pads in this index refer to the gross leasable building floor area.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15124, a statement of the project objectives was provided on page 3.0-1 of the 1994 EIR. These objectives are as follows:

1. To create a major waterfront attraction including a recreational harbor and world-class aquarium, to provide affordable recreation and entertainment for the people of Long Beach, for the residents of the Southern California region, and for visitors from other states and countries.
2. To complete development of the downtown waterfront in a manner which is supportive of the downtown redevelopment effort and the Convention Center expansion.
3. To create a continuous system of attractive and functional public parks and promenades along the waterfront on both sides of Queensway, providing that there is no net loss in public open space.
4. To minimize the disturbance of valuable natural habitat areas, and to fully mitigate the loss of any such areas within the project boundaries, to the extent possible.
5. To provide no less than 350 boat slips as replacement for those to be lost within the Port of Long Beach.
6. To generate sufficient revenue from the project to support both its capital and operating costs.

The Sierra Hotel project represents a small component of the overall Pike at Rainbow Harbor development, and although 275 hotel rooms were proposed as part of the scaled down project (the 1994 EIR analyzed a project with 950 total hotel/inn rooms), no hotel land uses have been established in the Pike project area to date. This land use is therefore consistent with the intended types of uses for the Pike development and reflects the project objectives set forth in the 1994 EIR as listed above. No changes or additions to these Pike project objectives are proposed as part of the Sierra Hotel project.

### **3.5 Discretionary Actions**

The purpose of this Supplemental EIR is to analyze the proposed Sierra Hotel project as a minor change to the Pike at Rainbow Harbor development and all activities described in Section 4.0 of this EIR. This analysis is intended to apply to all project approvals and other approvals necessary for implementation of the Sierra Hotel project.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15124, agencies expected to use this Supplemental EIR in their decision-making process include the Long Beach Planning Commission, the Long Beach City Council (if any decision of the Long Beach Planning Commission is appealed), the California Coastal Commission, the California State Lands Commission, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the California Department of Transportation, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Use of this EIR in an agency's decision-making process does not confer any approval or permit authority not previously granted to such agency by law.

The following is a list of discretionary approvals by the City of Long Beach (Lead Agency) and Responsible Agencies:

#### City of Long Beach Planning Commission

- Certification of the Supplemental EIR
- Site Plan Review approval

#### City of Long Beach City Council

- On Appeal of Planning Commission approvals only: Certification of Supplemental EIR and Site Plan Review

#### California Coastal Commission

- Coastal Permit modification approval

### California State Lands Commission

- Reversion of Sierra Hotel project site back to Tidelands public trust status and approval of hotel land use as a permitted use consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine (see Section 4.4, Land Use and Planning, of this Supplemental EIR for further discussion of this requirement)

Required non-discretionary (ministerial) City permits/approvals involve grading permits, building permits, street work permits issued by the City to allow site preparation and construction. The Sierra Hotel project is proposed for development in a single phase which would include site preparation, grading, trenching, installation and connection of project utilities into the public utilities systems. A Phase I Site Assessment and a Phase II Subsurface Investigation have been prepared for this hotel land use (included in Appendix F and analyzed in Section 4.3 of this Supplemental EIR).



Figure 3-1

Figure 3-2

Figure 3-3

Figure 3-4

Figure 3-5

Figure 3-6

Figure 3-7

Figure 3-8



Figure 3-9

Figure 3-10

Figure 3-10 (cont)

## **SECTION 4.0**

### **ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

This chapter contains impact analysis sections for the environmental factors that could experience potentially significant project impacts, based on the Initial Study findings. Each environmental factor section includes a description of the environmental setting, analysis of potential project impacts, and mitigation measures, if determined necessary to reduce identified potential impacts.

#### **4.0-1 Notice of Preparation (NOP) Distribution**

On November 18, 2004, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this Supplemental EIR was distributed by the City of Long Beach to various public and private entities, including the State Clearinghouse, and filed with the Office of the County Clerk for Los Angeles County (see Appendix B). In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, the NOP was circulated to the agencies and individuals listed in Appendix B for a 30 day review period starting November 18, 2004 and ending December 17, 2004. The State Clearinghouse distributed copies of the NOP to the following Responsible Agencies: State Resources Agency, Department of Parks and Recreation, Department of Water Resources, Department of Fish and Game Region 5, Department of Health Services, Native American Heritage Commission, Caltrans District 7, Department of Toxic Substance Control, and Regional Water Quality Control Board Region 4.

Written comments were sent by the following agencies in response to this NOP (copies of all NOP response letters are provided in Appendix C):

- State Clearinghouse (11/23/04)
- County Sanitation District of Los Angeles County (11/29/04)
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (11/30/04)
- Metropolitan Transportation Authority (12/1/04)
- State Department of Transportation, District 7 (12/2/04)
- Southern California Association of Governments (12/7/04)
- Department of Toxic Substance Control (12/23/04)
- County of Los Angeles Fire Department (1/21/05)

The City of Long Beach held a public Scoping Meeting on November 30, 2004 in the Bixby Park Social Hall to provide project information on the proposed Sierra Hotel and solicit input from interested parties on environmental issues to be addressed in this Supplemental EIR.

#### **4.0-2 Initial Study**

The Initial Study Environmental Checklist was included in the NOP circulation and provided in Appendix B of this Supplemental EIR. For each Threshold of Significance listed in this Initial Study, one of a possible four determinations was made: the Sierra Hotel project would either have a Potentially Significant Impact, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation, Less Than Significant Impact, or No Impact. Any Threshold of Significance where the Sierra Hotel project could have either a Potentially Significant Impact or a Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation is subject to further CEQA analysis in Sections 4.1 through 4.6 of this Supplemental EIR. Potential impacts that fall under either the Less Than Significant Impact or No Impact determination are discussed under 4.0-3 Effects Found Not To Be Significant.

A breakdown of all Thresholds of Significance in which the proposed Sierra Hotel project could have impacts at either the Potentially Significant Impact or Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation level is provided below:

##### Potentially Significant Impact

It has been determined in the Initial Study that the Sierra Hotel project would not result in a Potentially Significant Impact for any of the Thresholds of Significance.

##### Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation

The proposed Sierra Hotel project would result potentially significant impacts involving the following Thresholds of Significance, which could be reduced to a Less Than Significant Level with Mitigation Incorporation:

##### I. Aesthetics:

- d) The project could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

##### IX. Land Use and Planning:

- b) The project could conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

##### XI. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System

- a) The project could result in a significant loss of pervious surface.

##### XVI. Transportation/Traffic

- f) The project could result in an inadequate parking capacity.

#### **4.0-3 Effects Found Not To Be Significant**

As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15128, an EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. Previous determinations from the 1994 EIR (EIR 13-94) and 1998 Negative Declaration (ND 5-98) are also summarized below.

The Initial Study (Appendix B) determined the following environmental effects of the proposed Sierra Hotel project would be at a less than significant level:

##### Aesthetics

Potential visual resource impacts for the entire Queensway Bay project were analyzed in the 1994 EIR (Section 6.14) and 1998 Negative Declaration (pages 40-45). The 1994 EIR did not identify any view node locations north of Shoreline Drive, and concluded that after mitigation the only unavoidable impact would be conversion of the passive lagoon park into an intensely active developed urban harbor.

The 1998 Negative Declaration identified view corridors along both Cedar and Pacific Avenues south of Ocean Boulevard that resulted from a recent residential project proposal located along the south side of Ocean Boulevard (The Park at Harbour View). These view corridors did not extend beyond the rights-of-way for both streets, and no structure in the Queensway Bay project was proposed to extend into a street rights-of-way. The only other identified view corridor in close proximity to the Sierra Hotel site extended from City Hall to the Queen Mary. However, this corridor was limited to more distant views from the upper levels of City Hall and was not a street level corridor. The Negative Declaration determined that the revised Queensway Bay project would not result in any new significant visual impacts.

As noted on page III-DS-2 of the Local Coastal Program, the south side of Ocean Boulevard along the Downtown Shoreline area contains a mixture of office and residential buildings. View corridors in the Pike vicinity were identified in the Local Coastal Program and were included in the applicable zoning district (PD-6, Downtown Shoreline Planned Development District). The Sierra Hotel site is located in Subarea 5 of PD-6, which allows one hotel of up to 12 stories in height to be located between the Cedar Avenue and Pacific Avenue extended rights-of-way. The Sierra Hotel project is proposed for this specified hotel location and would only be seven stories in height. In compliance with the Subarea 5 building mass and orientation requirements, this development pad is in a staggered location at the southeast corner of Shoreline Drive and Cedar Avenue, running parallel with the angled direction of Cedar Avenue. The view corridors closest to the Sierra Hotel site still follow the north-south street alignment of Cedar and Pacific Avenues from Ocean Boulevard to Seaside Way and do not extend

beyond the street rights-of-way. Therefore, the Sierra Hotel project would not adversely effect any existing view corridors.

In terms of nearby multi-story buildings subject to potential view obstruction, the Sierra Hotel project site is directly south of the six building, 538 unit apartment complex known as The Park at Harbour View (also known as Phase I of the Camden development). This entire apartment development is bounded by Seaside Way on the south, Pacific Avenue on the east, Ocean Boulevard on the north, and Chestnut Place on the west. Building 3 (250 W. Seaside Way) of this development is directly across from the Sierra Hotel project site on the opposite side of Seaside Way. In addition, the southern portions of Building 4 (41 Cedar Walk) and Building 5 (40 Chestnut Place), located on the north side of Seaside Way west of Cedar Avenue, are also close to the Sierra Hotel site. Other nearby residential structures are the Sovereign (360 W. Ocean Boulevard) located at the southeast corner of Ocean Boulevard and Chestnut Place, the Blackstone (330 W. Ocean Boulevard), and the remaining four buildings in The Park at Harbour View development opposite City Hall. All other nearby buildings along the south side of Ocean Boulevard are for commercial uses (California Bank and Trust, Verizon, Ocean Center).

The three Park at Harbour View buildings along the north side of Seaside Way (Buildings 3, 4, and 5) would be the only residential structures with southern views that could be directly impacted by the Sierra Hotel. As discussed on page 13 in the September 2000 EIR for the Camden development (EIR 20-00, SCH#2000061108), these three buildings consist of four stories over a two level parking structure. Therefore, the seven story Sierra Hotel building would block some southerly views from these neighboring residential structures. However, these existing southern views are limited to the multi-level parking structure at the southwest corner of Seaside Way and Cedar Avenue as well as existing Pike commercial structures both north and south of Shoreline Drive. Views south of the Pike to the Shoreline Village commercial area and the marina are therefore already partially obstructed by Pike structures.

The previously approved land use for the Sierra Hotel project site was a multi-story large screen format movie theater (IMAX theater) similar in height to the proposed hotel structure. As documented on page 41 of ND 5-98, this IMAX theater would have a 75 foot minimum height and 80 foot maximum height. The proposed Sierra Hotel would also range from 75 feet to 80 feet in height due to variations in the roof line. This modification to the Pike project would therefore not result in any new increases in approved building height that would create any significant new view obstructions. The Initial Study Checklist for this Supplemental EIR (page 9) concluded that the Sierra Hotel project would have a Less Than Significant Impact on surrounding scenic vistas and no further CEQA analysis is required.

There are no scenic highways or natural scenic resources in the Sierra Hotel project site vicinity. There are no trees or rock outcroppings in the project vicinity. The 1994 EIR identified the following structures in the project vicinity as historically significant: HMS Queen Mary luxury oceanliner, the Villa Riviera residential building (800 E. Ocean Boulevard), the Breakers Hotel and Retirement Home building (200 E. Ocean Boulevard), the Ocean Center office building (110 W. Ocean Boulevard), the Blackstone residential building (330 W. Ocean Boulevard), and the Sovereign residential building (354-360 W. Ocean Boulevard). The Loeff Hippodrome building was also included in this list, but has since been demolished for a separate residential development project (The Park at Harbour View), although the rounded roof and cupola from the Loeff building has been saved as part of The Park at Harbour View development. The proposed project would not impact the use or visual enjoyment of any nearby historically significant structures. Therefore, the proposed hotel project would have No Impact on any scenic resources as determined by the Initial Study and no further CEQA analysis is required.

The proposed hotel would be developed on a vacant development pad within the Pike at Rainbow Harbor commercial complex. The architectural design, color scheme and facade improvements are intended to complement of the existing Pike structures as well as other nearby structures. Since the proposed hotel would result in a structure both complementary to surrounding buildings and a visual improvement over the existing vacant site, the project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. The Initial Study therefore made a No Impact determination on this threshold and no further CEQA analysis is necessary.

The Initial Study found the hotel potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare would be considered Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation. Analysis of potential light and glare impacts is provided in Section 4.1 of this Supplemental EIR.

#### Agriculture Resources

The Pike at Rainbow Harbor complex is not located within an agricultural zone, and there are no agricultural zones within the vicinity of the downtown area. Since there are no agricultural resources anywhere in or nearby the downtown area, the proposed hotel project will have no effect on any agricultural resources and the Initial Study determined the proposed hotel would have No Impact on any of the thresholds of significance related to agricultural resources (see page 9 of the Initial Study Checklist).

#### Air Quality

The Sierra Hotel project represents what is a relatively small component of the approximately 372,000 square feet of commercial building and patio area built to



date for the Pike at Rainbow Harbor. A full analysis of the original Queensway Bay project air quality impacts is included in the 1994 EIR (Section 6.6), which found that even after mitigation, the entire commercial/entertainment complex would result in an unavoidable adverse air quality impacts by exceeding the applicable thresholds for carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, particulates and reactive organic gases. This potential impact was duly considered when EIR 13-94 was certified by the Planning Commission. At that time, the Queensway Bay project proposed a total of 950 hotel rooms. The 1998 Negative Declaration, which analyzed a revised Queensway Bay project with only 275 hotel rooms, determined that there would be no new significant air quality impacts (page 36). As stated in Section 3.0 Project Description of this Supplemental EIR, there are presently no hotel land uses in the entire Pike development.

The Initial Study for this Supplemental EIR determined that the Sierra Hotel project would have no new significant impacts for any of the applicable air quality thresholds of significance (see page 9-10 of the Initial Study Checklist). Although the project would result in some short-term construction and long-term operational emissions, the size of the project development pad, extent of construction activities and adherence to NPDES standards (see Section 4.5 of this Supplemental EIR) would not result in any significant emission impacts. Short-term construction emissions involve air borne dust, construction equipment exhaust emissions, and construction worker passenger vehicle emissions. Long-term operational emissions involve exhaust emissions from customer and employee passenger vehicle emissions and delivery truck vehicle emissions.

While the Initial Study determined that the Sierra Hotel project would not have any new significant air quality impacts, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) provided written comments during the Notice of Preparation comment period (see Appendix C) that requested identification of all project-related air pollutant sources and calculation of potential air quality impacts from both project construction and operations. The air quality analysis provided in Section 4.2 of this Supplemental EIR is therefore in response to SCAQMD comments rather than the Initial Study findings.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the sub-region in which it is located, it is consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategy specified in the AQMP. The Sierra Hotel project is consistent with the goals of the City of Long Beach General Plan Air Quality Element that calls for achieving air quality improvements in a manner that continues economic growth. The estimated emissions from both project construction and operations would not exceed the established SCAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, this project would not result in any significant air quality impacts. However, Section 4.2 recommends conformance to SCAQMD Rule 403 on Fugitive Dust to insure proper dust control practices throughout project construction.

### Biological Resources

The 1994 EIR concluded that project mitigations would have beneficial impacts to project vicinity marine and avifaunal communities (Section 6.8). The 1998 Negative Declaration determined the revised project would have no new impacts (page 39).

The Sierra Hotel project site is located in a highly urbanized portion of the City, with predominately commercial and multi-family residential uses throughout the downtown area. The project development pad is a vacant dirt lot devoid of any vegetation or other biological resources. There is no evidence of rare or sensitive species as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations or Title 50 of the Federal Code of Regulations. There are no riparian habitats, protected wetlands or other sensitive natural communities in or adjacent to the project development pad. The proposed hotel will not interfere with the migratory movement of any wildlife species. The biological habitat and species diversity is limited to that typically found in highly populated and urbanized Southern California setting. The Initial Study therefore determined that this hotel proposal would have No Impact on any of the applicable Thresholds of Significance (see page 10-11 of the Initial Study Checklist) for biological resources and no further CEQA analysis is required.

### Cultural Resources

The 1994 EIR determined that no mitigations were necessary and the original project would have no significant impacts (Section 6.15) and the 1998 Negative Declaration required a detailed view analysis as a mitigation measure (page 46).

This hotel project will not result in extensive excavation or grading since no subterranean structures are proposed as part of the hotel improvements. Therefore, project construction will not impact any unknown latent artifacts. The hotel project development pad is located outside the area of the City expected to have a higher probability of latent artifacts. The project is not located in a historic district and none of the existing structures in the Pike at Rainbow Harbor are considered to have any historic value. The Initial Study therefore determined that this hotel proposal would have No Impact on any of the applicable Thresholds of Significance (see page 11 of the Initial Study Checklist) for cultural resources and no further CEQA analysis is necessary.

### Geology and Soils

The 1994 EIR determined that after mitigation, there would be no unavoidable adverse project impacts (Section 6.4). The 1998 Negative Declaration concluded that the revised project would not result in any new adverse impacts (page 33).

Based on the Initial Study findings, the Sierra Hotel project would have no geologic or soils impacts (see pages 11-12 of the Initial Study Checklist). No faults are known to pass beneath the project site, and the site is not in the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The most significant fault system in the vicinity is the Newport-Inglewood fault zone. The relative close proximity of the Newport-Inglewood Fault could create substantial ground shaking anywhere in the project vicinity if a seismic event occurred along the fault. However, there are numerous variables that determine the level of damage to any particular location. Given these variables it is not possible to determine the level of damage that may occur on the site during a seismic event. Based on the No Impact determinations for all geology and soils thresholds of significance, no further CEQA analysis is required.

#### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The 1994 EIR determined that after mitigation, no significant adverse hazard impacts would occur from the original project (Section 6.9). The 1998 Negative Declaration Initial Study concluded that the revised project would have no new impacts and no discussion was added to this finding (page 17).

The Initial Study for this Supplemental EIR determined that the Sierra Hotel project would have No Impact for any of the hazards/hazardous materials thresholds of significance (see page 12 of the Initial Study Checklist). However, the State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) responded to the Notice of Preparation for the Sierra Hotel project in a letter dated December 23, 2004 (see Appendix C). The analysis contained in Section 4.3 of this EIR is therefore provided in response to the DTSC comments rather than the Initial Study findings.

Hotel construction would not involve any hazards to construction workers or the general public unless an occurrence of an accidental spill, leak, fire or explosion releases hazardous materials and is not immediately and adequately contained. Accident prevention and containment will be the responsibility of the construction contractors, with provisions to properly manage hazardous substances a standard mandatory component of all approved construction plans and specifications. It is therefore expected that proper hazardous materials management will be a requirement of the construction contractor in the project specifications and no further CEQA analysis is necessary.

Project operations would involve use of typical cleaners, solvents, and insecticides commonly used in the hotel industry. Numerous federal, state and local regulations control the transport, use, storage and disposal of hazardous materials and therefore no further CEQA analysis of hotel operations is required.

In terms of possible soil contamination, the Phase I and II Assessments prepared for this hotel concluded that no further action or investigation related

contamination is necessary (see Appendix F). However, in response to the DTSC comment letter, Section 4.3 includes a mitigation measure to halt all construction activity if soil contamination is suspected and sets forth soil remediation procedures.

#### Hydrology and Water Quality

The 1994 EIR determined that after mitigation, there would be no unavoidable adverse water quality impacts (Section 6.5). The 1998 Negative Declaration found that the revised project would not result in any new significant impacts (page 33-35).

The Initial Study for this Supplemental EIR (page 13) determined that the Sierra Hotel project would have no impacts for any of the significance thresholds and therefore no further CEQA analysis is required. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has prepared a Flood Hazard Map designating all potential flood zones in the City. The hotel project is located in Zone X, which is not a FEMA designated flood hazard zone. All storm and sanitary sewer drains are currently in place for the project site vicinity. The project is within a highly urbanized area with stormwater drainage infrastructure in place. Water runoff control is addressed in Section 4.5 National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) of this EIR.

#### Land Use and Planning

The 1994 EIR concluded that after mitigation, the original Queensway Bay project would result in the following unavoidable adverse impacts (Section 6.2): convert Shoreline Aquatic Park from a passive green park into a major urbanized harbor development; retain 15.29 acres of usable parkland, with a displaced 9.4 acres replaced with 12.07 acres in the events park; and create an events park approximately 1.5 miles south of the existing park that encourages vehicular travel which could result in vehicle congestion during major special events.

The 1998 Negative Declaration determined that any new impacts from the revised project would be beneficial in nature (page 29).

Based on the Initial Study findings for this Supplemental EIR (page 14), the Sierra Hotel project would not physically divide an established community, since this hotel would occupy a currently vacant development pad located within the Pike at Rainbow Harbor complex. Hotel land uses are considered an integral component of this commercial/entertainment complex and, although included in the analysis of both the 1994 EIR and 1998 Negative Declaration, no hotel land use has ever been established in the Pike at Rainbow Harbor.

The Sierra Hotel project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan since the hotel development pad is not within or adjacent to any such habitat and there are no plans to convert this portion of the Pike complex into any type of natural habitat.

The Initial Study for this Supplemental EIR found that the hotel impact with applicable land use plans, policies or regulations would be considered Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation due to an existing Exchange Agreement with the State Lands Commission. Analysis of this land use threshold impact is provided in Section 4.4 of this EIR.

### Mineral Resources

Mineral resources were not analyzed in the 1994 EIR. The 1998 Negative Declaration analyzed Energy and Mineral Resources, concluding in the Initial Study that the revised project would have no adverse impacts and added no discussion to this finding.

The Initial Study for this Supplemental EIR (page 14) found that the Sierra Hotel would have no impacts on mineral resources and therefore no further CEQA analysis is necessary. Traditionally, the primary mineral resource within the City of Long Beach has been oil. From the beginning of this century, oil extraction operations within the City have diminished as this resource has become depleted due to extraction operations. Today oil extraction continues but on a much reduced scale in comparison to that which occurred in the past. The proposed hotel development pad does not contain any oil extraction operations and this hotel land use is not anticipated to have a negative impact on oil resources. There are no other known mineral resources on the site that could be negatively impacted by hotel construction or operation.

### National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

Neither the 1994 EIR or 1998 Negative Declaration analyzed this environmental factor.

The Initial Study for this Supplemental EIR (page 14) found that the hotel project's potential to create a significant discharge of pollutants into a storm drain or water way would be a Less Than Significant Impact. The hotel would have No Impact regarding the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. Therefore, no further CEQA analysis of these two NPDES significance thresholds is required. The Initial Study determined that the hotel project impact regarding the significant loss of pervious surface would be considered Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation. Analysis of this NPDES significance threshold is provided in Section 4.5 of this EIR.

## Noise

The 1994 EIR found that the original Queensway Bay project would result in construction-related short term noise impacts as well as long term increases in the local ambient noise level due to daily project operations. However, after mitigation neither short term or long term impacts were considered significant since the anticipated noise levels would not exceed the thresholds established in that EIR (Section 6.10).

The 1998 Negative Declaration determined that even though generally taller and larger buildings are included in the revised project than originally proposed, there would not be any new significant impacts since there are no sensitive noise receptors in the project vicinity (page 39).

The Initial Study for this Supplemental EIR (page 14-15) concluded that the Sierra Hotel project would not result in any significant noise impacts. All significance thresholds for noise were determined to be at a No Impact or Less Than Significant Impact level (see pages 14 and 15 of the Initial Study Checklist). This finding is due to the highly urbanized character of the Pike development and surrounding land uses. Hotel land uses are not considered to be a significant daytime noise generator, and are similar to residential land uses in sensitivity to nighttime noise levels. Project construction would be subject to all applicable City Noise Regulations (Chapter 8.80 of the Long Beach Municipal Code). Therefore, no further CEQA analysis of noise thresholds is necessary.

## Population and Housing

As discussed in Section 6.3 of the 1994 EIR, although the Queensway Bay project would increase future employment, residential and user populations in the City, these impacts were not considered to exceed the established thresholds of significance and no mitigations were necessary. No new significant impacts were anticipated to result from the revised project analyzed by the 1998 Negative Declaration (page 33).

No population or housing impacts would result from the Sierra Hotel project, as determined by the Initial Study on page 15. There are no residential components to this hotel project and the increased employment from this land use would be a beneficial impact for Long Beach, which based on estimates from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), has a housing-rich jobs/housing ratio of 1.09 jobs per housing (compared with the five county SCAG region jobs/housing ratio of 1.42 jobs per housing unit, which is considered a balanced ratio). No further CEQA analysis is therefore necessary.

## Public Services

After mitigation through payment of the appropriate school impact fee, the 1994 EIR determined that project impacts would be less than significant (Section 6.11). The 1998 Negative Declaration concluded that while the Queensway Bay project would continue to place demands on police and school services, no new impacts were reported (pages 39-40).

The Initial Study for this Supplemental EIR (page 15) found that impacts to fire and police protection services would be Less Than Significant, while the Sierra Hotel project would be at a No Impact level for all other public service significance thresholds. Fire protection is provided by the Long Beach Fire Department. The Department has 23 in-city stations. The Department is divided into Fire Prevention, Fire Suppression, Bureau of Instruction, and the Bureau of Technical Services. The Fire Department is accountable for medical, paramedic, and other first aid rescue calls from the community. Crime prevention services are provided by the Long Beach Police Department. The Department is divided into Patrol, Traffic, Detective, Juvenile, Vice, Community, Jail, Records, and Administration Sections. The City has four Patrol Divisions; East, West, North and South. The City of Long Beach is primarily served by the Long Beach Unified School District, which also serves Signal Hill and parts of Lakewood. Although this School District has been operating at or over capacity in recent years, the Sierra Hotel project has no residential component and employment generated from this land use is not expected to significantly impact public school resources.

Based on this Initial Study determination, no further CEQA analysis for public services is necessary.

## Recreation

The 1994 EIR determined that after mitigation to provide bicycle and pedestrian trails along with protection of boat launch ramps and boat slips, the Queensway Bay project impacts related to increased recreational demand would not exceed the established significance thresholds (Section 6.16). The revised project was found to be at a No Impact level according to the Initial Study for the 1998 Negative Declaration (page 19), and no discussion was added to this finding.

The Initial Study for this Supplemental EIR concluded the Sierra Hotel project would also be at a No Impact level (page 16). Hotel patrons do not typically generate significant demand impacts on neighborhood or regional parks. The Sierra Hotel will provide guests with a ground floor exercise room and a rooftop pool and spa deck area. While this hotel will generate increased employment, this would not produce significant demands on existing Citywide recreational facilities. Therefore, no further CEQA analysis is required.

### Transportation/Traffic

The 1994 EIR concluded that implementation of project-specific mitigation measures and physical improvements on the Citywide transportation system would reduce potentially unavoidable adverse impacts at a number of intersections (Section 6.7). The 1998 Negative Declaration determined that the additional traffic generated by the revised project was not likely to be significant and would be less than the impacts anticipated under the 1994 EIR due to the reduced scale of this revised project (pages 36-37).

The only significance threshold identified as Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation for the Sierra Hotel project is the project's potential to result in inadequate parking capacity (page 16). All other significance thresholds were determined to be at either the No Impact or Less Than Significant Impact level. This is due to the fact that even after development of the Sierra Hotel pad and the last remaining vacant pad in the Pike complex (Building E2 pad, located on the west side of Cedar Avenue between Bay Street and Shoreline Drive), the fully developed Pike complex will have approximately the same or less than the amount of total floor area as the revised project analyzed by the 1998 Negative Declaration. Therefore, no further CEQA analysis of these significance thresholds would be required.

Section 4.6 of this Supplemental EIR provides an analysis of the potential parking impacts generated by this proposed hotel land use. A Traffic and Parking Study has been prepared for this project proposal and is included in this document under Appendix G.

### Utilities and Service Systems

The 1994 EIR concluded that after mitigation, the original project would not exceed the established thresholds of significance for utility systems (Section 6.12). The 1998 Negative Declaration stated on page 40 that the original EIR found that the City's utilities can meet the needs of the Queensway Bay Master Plan and that continues to be the case for the revised project.

The Initial Study for this Supplemental EIR concluded that the Sierra Hotel project potential impacts would be at a No Impact level for all significance thresholds on utilities and service systems (pages 16-17). This finding is consistent with the 1998 Negative Declaration determination and therefore no additional CEQA analysis is necessary.



## **SECTION 4.1 AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES**

### **4.1.1 Existing Conditions**

Aesthetics typically involves the visual qualities of a site or area within a given field of view as affected by both the natural and built environment. This field of view, also referred to as a viewshed, may be impacted by visual obstructions as well as light and glare generation. Visual obstructions may consist of natural (i.e., trees) or man-made (i.e., large buildings) impediments that obstruct an existing visual corridor such as views from the project site vicinity to the downtown harbor.

Light impacts usually occur from artificial lighting during nighttime hours from both stationary sources (i.e., street lights) and mobile source (i.e., automobile headlights). Land uses with residential occupancies such as hotels are considered to be light sensitive at nighttime since lighting spillover can interfere with sleep and privacy expectations.

Glare is typically associated with the reflection of sunlight or artificial lightings on reflective building surfaces. Daytime glare is common in urban areas, characterized by building surfaces that include highly reflective glass or metallic materials. Nighttime glare can result from the reflection of artificial light sources such as automobile headlights onto reflective building materials. As with light impacts, hotels are considered a glare sensitive land use.

#### State Regulations

The California Scenic Highway Program is intended to preserve and protect scenic highway resources as designated by Caltrans. There are no designated or eligible scenic highways impacted by the proposed project. The nearest highways eligible for designation are the I-710 and I-405 freeways and Pacific Coast Highway (State Route 1).

#### Local Regulations

The project site is located in Subarea 5 of the PD-6 (Downtown Shoreline Planned Development District) zoning district. Per the PD-6 regulations, buildings in Subarea 5 are to be sited so as to provide staggered locations near Seaside Way, Shoreline Drive, or Pine Avenue. Building mass and orientation must minimize view blockage from overlooks and buildings in Subareas 4 and 5 of PD-6. The intent of building height and location shall be to enhance the required view corridors from Ocean Boulevard through Subarea 4 to the water. Structures shall be designed to minimize blockage to the water from buildings in Subareas 4 and 5. Building facades and rooftops which are visible from view

corridors, buildings in Subarea 4, the Convention Center and Promenade South shall be attractively treated to enhance these views.

#### **4.1.2 Project Impacts**

The Sierra Hotel project would be considered to have a significant impact to aesthetic resources if the project would exceed any of the following thresholds of significance:

- a. The project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- b. The project would substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway;
- c. The project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings;
- d. The project would create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

The Initial Study (Appendix B) determined that the Sierra Hotel project has the potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, but the potential impacts would be at a less than significant level with appropriate mitigation incorporation. Project impacts to all other significance thresholds listed above would result in no environmental impact or less than significant impacts. The environmental factors involved in making these determinations are provided below.

In regard to scenic vistas, the project site is a vacant development pad intended for improvement as part of The Pike at Rainbow Harbor retail/entertainment complex. The Visual Resource section of 1994 EIR (EIR 13-94) did not identify any view nodes of the downtown harbor or waterfront from any location north of Shoreline Drive (see Figure 6.14-1 of the 1994 EIR). That EIR determined the Queensway Bay project cumulative impacts would be positive in nature by adding attractive, interesting and functional structures to areas that were formerly vacant, blighted or deteriorated, with an unavoidable impact of converting a passive lagoon park into an active urban harbor (page 6.14-4).

The 1998 Negative Declaration (ND 5-98) analyzed the following view corridors north of Shoreline Drive: the view from the upper levels of City Hall to the Queen Mary, and views extending along both Cedar and Pacific Avenues between Ocean Boulevard and Seaside Way. The only unavoidable impact identified in 1998 Negative Declaration was elimination of an existing view corridor from Shoreline Drive and the Aquarium to Shoreline Harbor, which would be compensated by a new and more important corridor from Pine Avenue and Shoreline Drive (page 42).

Subarea 5 of PD-6 (the project site zoning district) allows one hotel of up to 12 stories in height to be located between the Cedar Avenue and Pacific Avenue extended rights-of-way. The Sierra Hotel project proposed for this specific location would only be seven stories in height. In compliance with the PD-6 building mass and orientation requirements, this development pad is in a staggered location at the southeast corner of Shoreline Drive and Cedar Avenue, running parallel with the angled direction of Cedar Avenue. As discussed in Section 4.0 of this Supplemental EIR, the proposed hotel would be at the same height as the large screen format movie theater previously approved for this development pad, and therefore the Sierra Hotel project would not result in any new increases in approved building height that would create any significant new view obstructions and would have a Less Than Significant Impact on surrounding scenic vistas.

There are no scenic highways or natural scenic resources in the project site vicinity. There are no trees or rock outcroppings in the project vicinity. As previously stated Section 4.0, the proposed project would not impact the use or visual enjoyment of any nearby historically significant structures.. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially damage any scenic resources.

The proposed project would result in the construction and operation of a seven story hotel building on a vacant development pad within The Pike at Rainbow Harbor complex. The architectural design, color scheme and facade materials are intended to complement the existing Pike structural improvements as well as other nearby structures (i.e. Pike parking garage west of Cedar Avenue and south of Seaside Way, The Park at Harbour View residential development). Since the project would result in a hotel structure both complementary to surrounding buildings and a visual improvement over the existing vacant project site, the project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.

In terms of project generated light or glare, the project could have the potential to adversely affect day or nighttime views through creation of new light or glare impacts. Whether new project light and glare impacts exceed the threshold of significance is dependent upon the type of exterior building materials and the extent of lighting spillover to streets and surrounding structures. These potential impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level through incorporation of the recommended mitigation measures set forth below.

#### **4.1.3 Mitigation Measures**

While the proposed project would not substantially effect scenic vistas, damage scenic resources, or degrade the existing visual character of the project site, use of either high reflectivity exterior building materials or unshielded exterior lighting fixtures could create a new source of substantial light or glare. However,

adherence to the following mitigation measures would reduce potential light and glare impacts to a less than significant level:

**Mitigation Measure 4.1.1: Exterior Building Materials**

Prior to the approval of any building permits, the applicant shall submit plans and specifications for all exterior materials to both the Department of Planning and Building and the Department of Public Works for review and approval to ensure that no exterior building materials or window glass treatments would create uncomfortable light or glare impacts to any public or private roadways or surrounding property improvements. No glass shall be permitted to have a reflectivity greater than 15% without submittal of a reflective glare study for the review and approval by both the Director of Planning and Building and the Director of Public Works. No exterior building surface shall consist of any reflective metallic surfaces.

Monitoring Phase: Prior to issuance of a building permit

Enforcement Agency: Department of Planning and Building  
Department of Public Works

Monitoring Agency: Department of Planning and Building  
Department of Public Works

**Mitigation Measure 4.1.2: Exterior Lighting**

Prior to the approval of any building permits, the applicant shall submit plans and specifications for all exterior lighting fixtures and light standards to both the Department of Planning and Building and the Department of Public Works for review and approval to ensure incorporation of glare control visors and shields. The submitted plans and specifications shall include a photometric design study verifying no significant lighting spillover to any public or private roadways or surrounding properties.

Monitoring Phase: Prior to issuance of a building permit

Enforcement Agency: Department of Planning and Building  
Department of Public Works

Monitoring Agency: Department of Planning and Building  
Department of Public Works

It is anticipated that any potential aesthetics impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporation.

## **SECTION 4.2 AIR QUALITY**

### **4.2.1 Existing Conditions**

This section analyzes the potential project impacts on air quality for both project construction and project operations. Impact analysis has been performed in accordance with the policies set forth in the City's General Plan Air Quality Element as well as applicable state and federal regulations.

#### Regional Setting

The South Coast Air Basin is subject to possibly some of the worst air pollution in the country, attributable mainly to its topography, climate, meteorological conditions, a large population base, and highly dispersed urban land use patterns.

Air quality conditions are primarily affected by the rate and location of pollutant emissions and by climatic conditions that influence the movement and dispersion of pollutants. Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients, along with local and regional topography, provide the links between air pollutant emissions and air quality.

The South Coast Air Basin generally has a limited capability to disperse air contaminants because of its low wind speeds and persistent temperature inversions. In the Long Beach area, predominantly daily winds consist of morning onshore airflow from the southwest at a mean speed of 7.3 miles per hour and afternoon and evening offshore airflow from the northwest at 0.2 to 4.7 miles per hour with little variability between seasons. Summer wind speeds average slightly higher than winter wind speeds. The prevailing winds carry air contaminants northward and then eastward over Whittier, Covina, Pomona and Riverside.

The majority of pollutants normally found in the Los Angeles County atmosphere originate from automobile exhausts as unburned hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen and other materials. Of the five major pollutant types (carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, sulfur oxides, and particulates), only sulfur oxide emissions are dominated by sources other than automobile exhaust.

The California Air Resources Board regulates mobile emissions and oversees the activities of county Air Pollution Control Districts (APCDs) and regional Air Quality Management Districts (AQMDs) in California. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the regional agency empowered to regulate stationary and mobile sources in the South Coast Air Basin.

#### **4.2.2 Project Impacts**

The Sierra Hotel project would be considered to have a significant impact to air quality if the project would exceed any of the following thresholds of significance:

- a. The project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;
- b. The project would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- c. The project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors);
- d. The project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations;
- e. The project would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

The Initial Study (Appendix B) determined that the Sierra Hotel project would have no new significant air quality impacts for any of the above listed thresholds of significant beyond impacts previously analyzed in the 1994 EIR (EIR 13-94). While the project would result in some short-term construction and long-term operational emissions, the size of the project development pad, extent of construction activities and adherence to NPDES standards (see Section 4.5 of this Supplemental EIR) would result in less than significant emission impacts. Short-term construction emissions involve air borne dust, construction equipment exhaust emissions, and construction worker passenger vehicle emissions. Long-term operational emissions involve exhaust emissions from customer and employee passenger vehicle emissions and delivery truck vehicle emissions.

While the Initial Study determined that the Sierra Hotel project would not have any significant air quality impacts, SCAQMD provided written comments during the Notice of Preparation comment period (see Appendix C) that requested identification of all project-related air pollutant sources and calculation of potential air quality impacts from both project construction and operations. The following air quality analysis is therefore provided in response to SCAQMD comments rather than the Initial Study findings.

#### **Environmental Review Background**

The 1994 EIR analyzed both short-term construction emission impacts and long-term operational emission impacts. The following two Mitigation Measures were set forth in the EIR's Mitigation Monitoring Program:

1. All project demolition and construction activities shall conform with Rule 403 of the South Coast Air Quality Management District during demolition and construction.
2. Every project business with 100 or more employees (referred to as “each qualifying project” in the Mitigation Monitoring Program) shall prepare a trip reduction plan in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1503.

In addition, the 1994 EIR suggested, but did not include in its Mitigation Monitoring Program as a specific mitigation measure, that shuttle services to airports and shopping centers be provided to reduce long-term operational impacts associated with the hotel project component.

The 1998 Negative Declaration (ND 5-98) concluded that while the revised project would increase the number of vehicle trips over existing conditions at that time, the threshold of significance would not be exceeded and no new significant impacts were anticipated.

To determine whether any project generates sufficient quantities of air pollution to be considered significant, the SCAQMD adopted maximum thresholds of significance for mobile and stationary producers in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), (i.e., cars, trucks, buses and energy consumption). SCAQMD Conformity Procedures (Section 6.3 of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 1993) states that all government actions that generate emission greater than the following thresholds are considered regionally significant (see Table 4.2.1).

**Table 4.2-1 SCAQMD Significance Thresholds**

<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Construction Thresholds (lbs/day)</b>	<b>Operational Thresholds (lbs/day)</b>
ROC	75	55
NO <sub>x</sub>	100	55
CO	550	550
PM <sub>10</sub>	150	150
SO <sub>x</sub>	150	150

#### Project Construction Impacts

Project generated emissions would involve both construction equipment activities and vehicle trips related to future project land uses. The project construction

period is anticipated to be up to 16 months (starting in 2005 and commencing in 2006) and will utilize the following construction equipment: one pile driver, one dozer for grading, one backhoe for trenching, one concrete pump for concrete flooring, one crane to hoist equipment, and one personnel/material hoist. The worst-case estimated emissions produced during the duration of construction activities are provided below in Table 4.2.2. The source of these estimates is from SCAQMD's URBEMIS 2002 Version 7.5.0 air pollution emissions model (see Appendix E for calculations).

**Table 4.2-2 Estimated Project Construction Emissions**

	<b>ROC</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>
Project Emissions	73.84	93.88	101.31	4.01
AQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150
Exceeds Thresholds	No	No	No	No

During construction activities, truck trips to and from the project site could generate potentially significant amounts of dust and particulate matter along the surrounding streets. No demolition is proposed since the Sierra Hotel development pad is presently vacant and devoid of any structural improvements. While no significant levels of dust or particulate matter are anticipated on the project site and adjoining properties, the project must comply with Rule 403 of the South Coast Air Quality Water District on Fugitive Dust.

The proposed construction activities would not generate or emit any objectionable odors. Construction odors would be limited to periodic diesel emissions from trucks hauling construction materials and equipment, which are generally not understood as objectionable and regulated by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

#### Project Operational Impacts

Based on the January 2005 Traffic and Parking Impact Study prepared for the Sierra Hotel project (see Appendix G), project operations would result in 814 daily trips, generating 38 trips in and 27 trips out during the AM Peak Hour and 42 trips in and 28 trips out during the PM Peak Hour (see Table 7, page 20 of this Study). The estimated emissions produced by project operations are provided below in Table 4.2.3. As with project construction, the source of these estimates is from SCAQMD's URBEMIS 2002 Version 7.5.0 air pollution emissions model (see Appendix E).



**Table 4.2-3 Estimated Project Operational Emissions**

	<b>ROC</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>
Project Emissions	10.22	10.56	108.58	7.71
AQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150
Exceeds Thresholds	No	No	No	No

### **4.2.3 Mitigation Measures**

The Southern California Association of Governments has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the sub-region in which it is located, it is consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategy specified in the AQMP. The Sierra Hotel project is consistent with the goals of the City of Long Beach General Plan Air Quality Element that call for achieving air quality improvements in a manner that continues economic growth. The estimated emissions from both project construction and operations would not exceed the established SCAQMD significant thresholds. Therefore, this project would not result in any significant air quality impacts. However, the following mitigation measure is recommended to insure proper dust control practices throughout project construction.

#### **Mitigation Measure 4.2.1: Dust Control**

All project construction activities shall conform to Rule 403 of the South Coast Air Quality Management District on Fugitive Dust.

Monitoring Phase: Throughout project construction period.

Enforcement Agency: Department of Planning and Building

Monitoring Agency: Department of Planning and Building

It is anticipated that potential dust emission impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporation.

## **SECTION 4.3 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

### **4.3.1 Existing Conditions**

The Sierra Hotel project site is a vacant development pad within the Pike at Rainbow Harbor commercial complex.

The 1994 EIR (EIR 13-94) documented that while extensive oil development and related activities have occurred along the downtown shoreline and port area since the early 1900s, no evidence has been found to suggest the presence of any hazardous substances along the City's north shoreline. Records from the Long Beach Department of Oil Properties indicate that no oil wells have been drilled on or adjacent to the Queensway Bay project site. No impacts relative to hazardous site conditions were anticipated as a result of the project analyzed in the 1994 EIR.

The 1998 Negative Declaration (ND 5-98) found that the amended Queensway Bay project would have no impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials and therefore no further analysis was warranted.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the project site was performed and completed on July 23, 2004 by VERTEX Engineering Services (see Appendix F). The primary purpose of this assessment was to identify the presence or likely presence of hazardous substances or petroleum products at the project site under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or material threat of a release into structures on the project site or into the ground, groundwater (defined as "recognized environmental conditions").

As noted on page 3 of this assessment, the entire project site was part of the Pacific Ocean until at least 1969, when this part of the Long Beach Harbor was reclaimed with fill material to bring it above sea level. The project site and surrounding properties were depicted as undeveloped land from as early as 1972. From about 1985, the most of the Pike project site was improved as an asphalt-paved parking lot for use by the Long Beach Convention Center and special event parking. The project is currently unpaved and is occupied only by a temporary trailer used for tenant coordination with the Pike at Rainbow Harbor. Historic land uses were considered not to be an environmental concern.

The Phase I Assessment concluded that based on the information reviewed and current regulatory guidelines, no recognized environmental conditions were found in connection with the project site. However, the potential for imported fill materials to have hazardous substances is considered a potential environmental concern and the Phase I Assessment therefore recommended that a focused

subsurface investigation be conducted to evaluate the potential presence of hazardous substances in the imported fill materials.

Pursuant to the Phase I Assessment findings, a Phase II Subsurface Investigation was performed by VERTEX and completed on August 26, 2004 (see Appendix F). The purpose of this Phase II investigation was to evaluate the likelihood that elevated concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile and semi-volatile compounds (VOCs and semi-VOCs), Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) 8 metals, and/or polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) are present in the project site fill materials. Two soil samples were collected from each of the test pits. One sample was collected at a depth of approximately 5 feet below ground surface and the other sample at a depth between 10 to 12 feet below ground surface. No odors or staining were noted in any of the test pits. The results of this Phase II investigation concluded that there is a very low likelihood any elevated concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons, VOCs, semi-VOCs, RCRA 8 metals, or PCBs are present at the project site. Based on the results on this investigation, current regulatory guidelines and the professional judgment of VERTEX staff, no further action or investigation was recommended.

#### **4.3.2 Project Impacts**

The Sierra Hotel project would be considered to have a significant impact regarding hazards and hazardous materials if the project would exceed any of the following thresholds of significance:

- a. The project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- b. The project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
- c. The project would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;
- d. The project would be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard for people residing or working in the project area;
- e. The project would be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, the project would be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area;

- f. The project would be within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area;
- g. The project would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan;
- h. The project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

The Initial Study (Appendix B) determined that the Sierra Hotel project would have no significant impacts relative to hazardous or hazardous materials for any of the above listed thresholds of significance. However, the State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) responded to the Notice of Preparation for the Sierra Hotel project in a letter dated December 23, 2004 (see Appendix C). The following analysis is therefore provided in response to the DTSC comments rather than the Initial Study findings.

The DTSC letter provided the following specific comments:

- 1. The draft EIR needs to identify and determine whether current or historic uses at the project site have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances at the project area.
- 2. The draft EIR needs to identify any known or potentially contaminated site within the project area. For all identified sites, the draft EIR needs to evaluate whether conditions at the site pose a threat to human health or the environment.
- 3. The draft EIR should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may require remediation, and which government agency will provide appropriate regulatory oversight.
- 4. If during construction of the project, soil contamination is suspected, construction in the area should stop and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented. If it is determined that contaminated soils exist, the draft EIR should identify how any required investigation and/or remediation will be conducted, and which government agency will provide regulatory oversight.

In regard to DTSC comments No. 1 and 2 above, there is no evidence of any current or historic land uses in or around the Sierra Hotel project site that have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes or hazardous substances. As stated above, City records indicate that no oil wells have been drilled on or nearby this site. Furthermore, the results of the Phase I assessment and Phase II

investigation conclude that the historic land uses have not resulted in any environmental concerns and there is a very low likelihood that elevated concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons, VOCs, semi-VOCs, RCRA 8 metals, or PCBs are present at the project site.

DTSC comment No. 3 is a recommendation to identify mechanisms needed for any required investigation and/or remediation as necessary. The Phase II investigation has concluded that the project has a very low likelihood of elevated hazardous materials concentrations and no further action or investigation was recommended. Therefore, no additional investigation or remediation would be required for this project.

DTSC comment No. 4 relates to the possibility of soil contamination and the recommended procedures should such contamination be suspected during any stage of project construction. While soil contamination is neither evidenced or anticipated, this comment can be incorporated into the project as a mitigation measure.

#### **4.3.3 Mitigation Measure**

The Sierra Hotel project would not result in any significant environmental impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials as determined by the Initial Study. However, the following mitigation measure would insure proper safety procedures if any soil contamination is suspected during project construction:

##### **Mitigation Measure 4.3.1: Soil Contamination**

- . If during construction of the project, soil contamination is suspected, construction in the area should stop and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented. If it is determined that contaminated soils exist, the draft EIR should identify how any required investigation and/or remediation will be conducted, and which government agency will provide regulatory oversight.

Monitoring Phase: Throughout project construction period.

Enforcement Agency: Department of Planning and Building

Monitoring Agency: Department of Planning and Building

It is anticipated that should any soil contamination be suspected during project construction, the potential impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporation.

## **SECTION 4.4 LAND USE AND PLANNING**

### **4.4.1 Existing Conditions**

#### Existing Regulatory Setting

##### **GENERAL PLAN**

The Sierra Hotel project development pad is located in General Plan Land Use District (LUD) No. 7, Mixed Use. The Mixed Use District is intended to provide a careful blending of different types of land uses in order to save time and energy in transportation and communications, simplify and shorten transactions of goods and services, vitalize a site, and give it more importance in the urban structure of the City. This District is intended for use in large, vital activity center rather than strips along major arterials. Combinations of land uses intended for this District include employment centers such as retail, office, medical facilities, higher density residences, visitor-serving facilities, personal and professional services, or recreational facilities.

Zoning districts considered consistent with the intent of LUD 7 are the various Planned Development (PD) districts located throughout the City.

##### **ZONING**

The entire Pike at Rainbow Harbor is located in Subareas 5 and 6 of the Downtown Shoreline Planned Development District (PD-6). Subarea 5 is located between Seaside Way and Shoreline Drive, while Subarea 6 is located south of Shoreline Drive. Subarea 5 allows retail, office, restaurant, entertainment display, educational, and recreational uses not to exceed 327,000 square feet of usable floor area. Subarea 6 permits up to 300,00 square feet of visitor serving commercial uses, including retail, restaurant, nightclub, movie, arcade and related entertainment uses.

The Sierra Hotel project is located entirely within Subarea 5 of PD-6. In addition to the 327,000 square feet of commercial uses listed above, hotel uses totaling up to 275 rooms are permitted, with restaurant lounge and retail facilities, primarily for hotel tenants, as accessory hotel uses.

Applicable development standards in PD-6, Subarea 5 are as follows:

Site Location: Buildings shall be sited to provide staggered locations near Seaside Way, Shoreline Drive and Pine Avenue, minimizing view blockage from overlooks and buildings in Subareas 4 and 5. Building facades and rooftops which are visible from view corridors, buildings in

Subarea 4, the Convention Center and Promenade South shall be attractively treated to enhance these views.

Height: A maximum of 12 stories is permitted for one hotel located between the extended rights-of-way of Cedar and Pacific Avenues.

## LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM

The proposed hotel is located in the Downtown Shoreline Community Planning Area of the City's Local Coastal Program, which was adopted by the Long Beach City Council and certified by the California Coastal Commission in 1980. As shown on the Downtown Shoreline Policy Plan (pages III-DS-17 and 18), the Sierra Hotel project site in Area #7 (Tidelands). The permitted land uses in this area are recreation, retail, restaurant, entertainment and educational uses, public access, hotel, coastally-related offices, and parking. As set forth on page III-DS-27, the western portion of this Tidelands area (located between what is now Aquarium Way and Chestnut Place) was intended to accommodate a 12 story hotel and a parking structure. This western portion presently contains a seven level parking structure and the Sierra Hotel development pad.

In 1995, the Coastal Commission certified the Queensway Bay Master Plan as an amendment to the 1980 Local Coastal Program. In 1998, the Coastal Commission approved another Local Coastal Program amendment increasing the authorized Queensway Bay commercial floor space from 535,000 square feet to 627,000 square feet. The Coastal Commission approved a Coastal Permit (5-98-156) for the Queensway Bay project on February 3, 1999.

## TIDELANDS TRUST

All of the land south of Seaside Way was created in the 1960s from fill materials and is considered public trust land (Tidelands). The fill activity was conducted by the City as part of a larger program for harbor improvement, flood control and shoreline configuration. A line which approximates the alignment of Seaside Way demarks the boundary between the tidelands and uplands areas, known as the "Chapter 138 Line" in reference to the California Statute section that formed the basis for the Tidelands Trust agreement between the City of Long Beach and the State of California. The Sierra Hotel project site is within the Tidelands Trust area and subject to the terms and provisions of this Trust.

The Tidelands Trust is administered by the City and subject to the oversight of the State Lands Commission. This Trust limits land uses in the Tidelands area to only those uses explicitly intended for the promotion and accommodation of the Port, commerce, navigation or fisheries related to the Port or tidelands, marine or aquatic recreational activities, or other activities related to the beach and the tidelands. Hotels are considered a permitted land use that is necessary and incidental to accommodate visitors to public trust lands.

In 2002, the City and the State Lands Commission entered into a Queensway Bay Exchange Agreement (see Appendix D), which arose out of the issue of potential conflict between land uses proposed by the City for the Queensway Bay project properties located north of Shoreline Drive and land uses authorized by the State Lands Commission under the Public Trust Doctrine. Pursuant to this Agreement, the City relinquished its Trustee status for five designated Queensway Bay parcels located north of Shoreline Drive, which includes the Sierra Hotel project development pad, and conveyed City-owned properties by the Los Angeles River to the State in exchange for the State conveying title of these Queensway Bay properties to the City. Initial land uses for each parcel were specified as a State condition of approval for this Agreement. The Sierra Hotel project site, identified as Queensway Bay Parcel A1 in this Agreement, was required to have a large screen format theater as the mutually agreed upon land use (see Exhibit O of this Agreement).

#### Existing Pike at Rainbow Harbor Development

The Sierra Hotel project development pad is currently a vacant lot in the northwestern portion of the Pike at Rainbow Harbor retail and entertainment complex. Properties adjacent to this project site are a multi-story parking garage to the west, a vacant development pad to the south, a two story multi-tenant commercial building within the Pike complex to the east, and a six building, 538 unit residential development (The Park at Harbour View) to the north.

According to the property owner (Developers Diversified Realty), as of March 2005 the Pike at Rainbow Harbor totals 362,237 square feet of gross building floor area (which includes 317,768 square feet of gross leasable building floor area) and 10,782 square feet of outdoor patio area. In addition, the Pike development currently has four vacant building pads (including the Sierra Hotel project site) totaling 51,524 square feet of lot area. The Pike land uses include a mixture of retail, restaurant and entertainment venues. There are no existing hotel land uses in the Pike at Rainbow Harbor development.

The Sierra Hotel development pad is located in the T1 block of the Tidelands Subarea (see Section 3.3) and has been improved with a seven level, 2,211 space parking structure and 41,065 square feet of gross floor area (which includes 32,075 square feet of gross leasable floor area) and 2,020 square feet of outdoor patio area.

#### **4.4.2 Project Impacts**

The Sierra Hotel project would be considered to have a significant impact on land use and planning if the project would exceed any of the following thresholds of significance:



- a. The project would physically divide an established community;
- b. The project would conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect;
- c. The project would conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

The Initial Study (Appendix B) determined that the Sierra Hotel project would have no impacts in regard to thresholds a. and c. above. However, the project as proposed would conflict with a land use policy agreement between the City and the State Lands Commission.

Development of the project site with an 91,304 square foot seven story, 140 room hotel will activate one of the last vacant areas in the overall Pike complex. The project is a permitted land use under the subject zoning district (PD-6, Subarea 5). The hotel land use is also consistent with the intended use for this portion of the Downtown Shoreline Community Planning Area under the City's Local Coastal Program.

The State Lands Commission considers hotel land uses to be an acceptable land use that is necessary and incidental to accommodate visitors to public trust lands. However, the Sierra Hotel project proposal is not consistent with the Queensway Bay Exchange Agreement between the City and the State Lands Commission, which specified a large screen format theater as the initial land use. In order for a hotel land use to be established at this location, the property must revert to its previous public trust status and the State Lands Commission must then make a determination whether the proposed Sierra Hotel project is a land use consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine.

#### **4.4.3 Mitigation Measures**

While the proposed hotel land use is consistent with the General Plan, Zoning, and Local Coastal Program land use requirements, this land use is not the mutually agreed land use set forth in the Queensway Bay Exchange Agreement between the City and the State Land Commission. In accordance with Conditions of State Approval Section H.5 for this Agreement, the following mitigation measure is recommended:

##### **Mitigation Measure 4.4.1: Tidelands Trust Status**

- . In accordance with the existing Queensway Bay Exchange Agreement, the City shall allow the Sierra Hotel project site to revert back to its status

as Tidelands public trust land and request the State Lands Commission to make a determination whether the proposed Sierra Hotel project is a land use consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine.

Monitoring Phase: Prior to issuance of a building permit

Enforcement Agency: Department of Planning and Building  
Community Development Department – Property  
Services Bureau

Monitoring Agency: Department of Planning and Building  
Community Development Department – Property  
Services Bureau

It is anticipated that any potential impacts related to land use will be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporation.

## **SECTION 4.5 NATIONAL POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM**

### **4.5.1 Existing Conditions**

#### Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) was amended in 1972 to require approval of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit prior to any point-source (stationary) discharge of pollutants into any waters of the United States, including any lakes, rivers, streams, or ponds. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has granted the State of California authority to enforce certain CWA provisions. The NPDES permit process is administered in California by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) in conjunction with the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) located throughout the State. The project site is regulated by the Los Angeles (Region 4) RWQCB.

The CWA was amended in 1987 to regulate storm water discharge (a non-point discharge), mandating such discharges fully comply with NPDES permit requirements. This amendment added Section 402(p) to the CWA and established a framework for regulating storm water discharges. Section 402(p) requires all municipal NPDES permits to effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges to the municipal separate storm sewer systems, except under certain provisions, and requires controls to reduce pollutants in discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems to the maximum extent practicable (MEP), including the use Best Management Practices (BMPs), control techniques, and system, design and engineering methods.

#### Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act

The 1969 Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (California Water Code, Section 13000 et seq.) established the State water quality control program which authorizes the SWQCB to implement the CWA provisions. This Act divided the State into nine RWQCBs. As stated above, the Sierra Hotel project site is located in the Los Angeles (Region 4) RWQCB area. Each RWQCB implements and enforces provisions of this Act and the CWA subject to the guidance and review of the SWQCB.

Pursuant to the CWA provisions, NPDES permits required for storm water discharges from municipal separate storm water systems (known as MS4 permits or municipal permits). The MS4 permits require implementation of a Storm Water Management Program by the discharger to reduce pollutant discharge to the maximum extent possible (MEP) pursuant to CWA Section 402(p).

The Los Angeles RWQCB has issued a municipal storm water NPDES permit for the City of Long Beach (NPDES Permit No. 99-060; CAS004003/CI 8052). As part of the RWQCB regulations for municipal NPDES permits, a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) was developed to address storm water pollution from private development projects. Local jurisdictions of Los Angeles County are required to adopt the requirements set forth by the regional SUSMP into the local SUSMPs, and implementation is required throughout the life of local development project operations to ensure storm water pollution is reduced through use of BMPs in the project design.

### Municipal Regulations

In accordance with the federal CWA and State Porter-Cologne Act, the City of Long Beach has adopted a Storm Water Management Program (SWMP) to reduce or eliminate storm water pollutants to the maximum extent possible (MEP). The local SWMP requires all development projects to implement BMPs, as applicable, for water conservation practices, material delivery and storage, material use, spill prevention and control, solid waste management, hazardous waste management, concrete waste management, vehicle and equipment cleaning, vehicle and equipment fueling, and vehicle and equipment maintenance.

Chapter 18.95 of the Long Beach Municipal Code sets forth the local NPDES and SUSMP regulations. As stated in Section 18.95.010, these local regulations give legal effect to certain requirements of the NPDES permit issued to the City and the subsequent SUSMP requirements mandated by the RWQCB, with the intent of effectively prohibiting non-storm water discharges into the storm drain systems or watercourses and requiring controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants into the storm water to the maximum extent possible. Section 18.95.050 sets forth the BMP requirements prior to issuance of any building or grading permit for any construction project.

### **4.5.2 Project Impacts**

The Sierra Hotel project would be considered to have a significant impact discharge of pollutants if the project would exceed any of the following thresholds of significance:

- a. The project would result in a significant loss of pervious surface;
- b. The project would create a significant discharge of pollutants into the storm drain or water way;
- c. The project would violation any best management practices of the National Pollution Elimination System permit.

The Initial Study (Appendix B) determined that the project would result in a significant loss of pervious surface (construction of a hotel building and paved courtyard on an existing vacant and unpaved development pad), but would not significantly impact storm drains or water ways and would not violate NPDES practices. In order to avoid any significant pollutant discharge impacts, construction of the proposed Sierra Hotel project will therefore require conformance with local NPDES regulations pursuant to Chapter 18.95 of the Long Beach Municipal Code.

The project would result in constructing approximately 16,829 square feet of new impervious surfaces for both the building footprint and ground floor courtyard (the building footprint is proposed at 14,336 square feet) for an existing unpaved, vacant development pad. After project completion, it is estimated that a peak rainfall rate 0.75 inches of rainfall would result in 1,338 gallons of runoff per minute for a five minute period.

As identified in the Initial Study, the Sierra Hotel project would result in a significant loss of existing pervious surface (unpaved, vacant development pad), which has the potential for significant pollutant discharge impacts if not properly mitigated.

#### Project Construction

Due to the existing level topography of the project development pad, extensive grading activities are not anticipated. The overall construction period is estimated to be approximately 16 months. Construction equipment would include one pile driver, one dozer for grading, one backhoe for trenching, one concrete pump for concrete flooring, one crane to hoist construction equipment, and one personnel/materials hoist.

Project construction could result in some soil erosion and/or storm water pollution during storm events if not properly monitored and controlled. Construction BMPs such as silt fencing or gravel bag dikes would effectively prevent storm water runoff. State regulations require a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to control potential storm water pollutant from project sites resulting in land disturbance of one or more acres as well as sites of less than one acre if the construction project is part of a larger development project (as is the case for the proposed Sierra Hotel project). A SWPPP must identify project design features and list all structural and non-structural BMPs used to reduce or prevent pollution to MEP standards.

#### **4.5.3 Mitigation Measures**

The following mitigation measures are intended to ensure the Sierra Hotel project fully complies with all applicable water quality regulations:

#### **Mitigation Measure 4.5.1: SWPPP and Monitoring Plan**

Prior to commencement of any soil disturbing activities, the applicant shall submit for approval to the RWQCB a Notice of Intent and shall prepare a SWPPP and monitoring plan for BMP implementation at MEP standards as applicable under current regulations.

Monitoring Phase: Prior to issuance of a building permit

Enforcement Agency: Los Angeles RWQCB

Monitoring Agency: Departments of Planning and Building  
Department of Public Works

#### **Mitigation Measure 4.5.2: SUSMP Plan**

The applicant shall submit for City review and approval a SUSMP to reduce and eliminate post-construction storm water runoff to MEP standards. The SUSMP shall include structural BMPs for the hotel and courtyard addressing urban runoff from the project site, including post-construction structural or treatment control BMPs designed to mitigate (infiltrate or treat) the volume of runoff produced from a 0.75 inch storm event prior to runoff discharge into a storm water conveyance system. The SUSMP shall also include provisions for storm drain stenciling and signage, proper designation of outdoor material storage areas (as applicable), and proof of ongoing BMP maintenance such as after-storm site cleaning.

Monitoring Phase: Prior to issuance of a building permit

Enforcement Agency: Los Angeles RWQCB

Monitoring Agency: Departments of Planning and Building and  
Department of Public Works

#### **Mitigation Measure 4.5.3: Best Management Practices**

All project construction activities shall be in full compliance with the federal NPDES program and Chapter 18.95 of the Long Beach Municipal Code (including all applicable requirements of Section 18.95.050). At a minimum, project construction shall include the following activities:

- a. Sediment for areas disturbed by construction shall be retained on-site using structural controls such as sandbags or fencing.
- b. Stockpiles of soil shall be properly contained to eliminate or reduce sediment transport from the project site to streets, drainage facilities or adjacent properties.
- c. Appropriate BMPs for construction-related materials, wastes, spills or residues shall be implemented to minimize transport to streets, drainage facilities or adjacent properties.
- d. All wastewater on the project site resulting from construction activities shall be pumped and removed to an appropriate disposal facility in accordance with NPDES requirements.
- e. Runoff from equipment and vehicle washing shall be contained on-site unless treated to reduce or remove sediment and other pollutants.
- f. All construction debris and waste materials shall be collected and properly disposed in trash containers or recycle bins.
- g. All streets and alleys in the project site vicinity used by project construction vehicles shall be dry swept to minimize mud, along with all applicable NPDES requirements for pollutant reduction techniques when flushing paved surfaces.

Monitoring Phase: Ongoing throughout project construction

Enforcement Agency: Los Angeles RWQCB

Monitoring Agency: Department of Planning and Building  
Department of Public Works

Implementation of the mitigation measures set forth above would reduce potential project impacts to a less than significant level by ensuring the project will not degrade surface water quality to below acceptable standards set forth by the RWQCB or other regulatory agencies.

## **SECTION 4.6 TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION AND PARKING**

### **4.6.1 Existing Conditions**

#### Project Background

An analysis of the Queensway Bay Master Plan was conducted by Linscott, Law and Greenspan for the 1994 EIR (EIR 13-94). The Mitigation Measures set forth in that EIR are listed on pages 6.7-50 through 6.7-52 as well as on pages 10.0-7 through 10.0-11 of the Mitigation Monitoring Program. Although the 1994 EIR determined that the Master Plan project as proposed would generate significant traffic and circulation impacts resulting in unacceptable levels of service at a number of intersections, implementation of the project specific mitigation measures and identified Citywide improvements would reduce these impacts.

The 1998 Negative Declaration (ND 5-98) determined that mitigation measures set forth in the 1994 EIR continued to be relevant to the project as revised at that time. This Negative Declaration concluded that the additional traffic generated by the proposal was not likely to be significant and would be less than traffic generated by the project analyzed in the 1994 EIR, since the Queensway Bay project had been scaled down from the original project proposal (p. 37).

#### Existing Traffic Operations

A Traffic and Parking Impact Study was prepared for the Sierra Hotel project by Meyer Mohaddes Associates in March 2005 (see Appendix G). A total of 33 key downtown intersections selected for analysis are listed in pages 1 and 2 of this Study. The roadways included in these intersections are Broadway, 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Ocean Boulevard, Magnolia Avenue, Cedar Avenue, Chestnut Avenue, Aquarium Way, Seaside Way, Pacific Avenue, and I-710 freeway.

The efficiency of traffic operations at an intersection is measured in terms of Level of Service (LOS), which is a measure of average intersection operating conditions based on volume to capacity (V/C) ratios during a specified hour of the day or night. LOS measures range from A to F, with A representing the best (free-flowing) conditions and F representing extreme congestion and intersection gridlock. The lowest acceptable LOS in an urban or suburban area is generally considered to be LOS D, with a LOS at E or F an unacceptable operating condition warranting mitigation.

The Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) methodology compares the level of traffic during peak hours at a signalized intersection (volume) to the amount of traffic that the intersection is able to carry (capacity). Signalized intersections with vehicular volumes that are at or near capacity ( $V/C = 1.0$ ) experience greater



congestion and longer vehicle delays (see Table 1, page 10 of this Study). Unsignalized intersections are analyzed differently from signalized intersections due to different operating characteristics. The Study analyzed intersections with stop signs by using the delay-based Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) method to determine LOS (see Table 2, page 10).

Existing morning (AM) and evening (PM) peak hour LOS conditions at the 33 selected intersections and provided in Table 3 of this Study (page 11). As shown on this Table, none of these intersections are currently operating below LOS D.

#### Existing Parking Supply

Parking for the Pike development is provided in three locations: 1) the seven level, 2,211 space Pike parking garage located across Cedar Avenue from the Sierra Hotel project site; 2) the 124 space valet parking lot located on the south side of Shoreline Drive by the adjacent restaurants; and 3) the 370 space employee parking lot located west of the Queensway Bridge on the south side of Shoreline Drive. These three parking locations provide a total of 2,705 available Pike parking spaces. In addition, metered parking is provided along Seaside Way between Chestnut Avenue and Pine Street for short term parking demand.

According to the Pike parking garage operator, Ace Parking, this garage is relatively empty during daytime hours and about one-quarter occupied on a typical Friday or Saturday evening. The results of an occupancy survey conducted on December 9 and 10, 2004 report a total 593 occupied parking garage spaces at 9:00 PM and that Friday and 640 occupied space at 9:00 PM on the following Saturday (see Table 4, page 12). However, several of the Pike land uses expected to utilize this garage were not fully developed or occupied at the time of this survey and peak parking demand would be expected to occur during the summer months.

#### Future Projected Growth

As a basis to evaluate the Sierra Hotel project's potential impact on local traffic conditions, future traffic conditions without the proposed project were determined using 2007 as the anticipated build-out year for the Sierra Hotel project. Projected Year 2007 No-Project Traffic Conditions consists of existing traffic plus ambient traffic growth (general background regional growth) as well as traffic generated by other nearby projects expected to be completed by 2007. Ambient growth is defined as regional background growth from projects outside the downtown study area and increased activity from existing developments within this study area. Based on area growth rates from the 2002 Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program and discussions with City staff, the Study factored in an annual background growth rate of 1.0 percent for future traffic volumes.

The City of Long Beach provided a list of pending and approved development projects in the downtown study area that for the purpose of this analysis are assumed to be completed by the year 2007 (see Table 5, page 16). Based on what the traffic consultant considered to be a worst-case projection, a total of 2,224 AM peak hour trips and 3,272 PM peak hour trips would be generated by the cumulative developments in the study area.

The projection of Year 2007 No-Project Traffic Conditions, based on existing traffic plus ambient traffic growth and traffic generated by related projects, identified two study area intersections which would operate at LOS E or F during the AM or PM peak hours. (see Table 6, page 17). The 3<sup>rd</sup> Street/Daisy Avenue intersection would be at LOS E during AM peak hour and the Ocean Boulevard/Shoreline Drive intersection would be at LOS E for the AM peak hour and LOS F for the PM peak hour.

#### **4.6.2 Project Impacts**

The Sierra Hotel project would be considered to have a significant impact to transportation and traffic if the project would exceed any of the following threshold of significance:

- a. The project would cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., results in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections);
- b. The project would exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways;
- c. The project would result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks;
- d. The project would substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment);
- e. The project would result in inadequate emergency access;
- f. The project would result in inadequate parking capacity;
- g. The project would conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

The Initial Study (Appendix B) determined that the Sierra Hotel project has the potential to result in inadequate parking capacity without mitigation incorporation. All other environmental thresholds listed above were determined at either a no impact or less than significant impact level.

Comments were received by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) and the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) regarding this hotel proposal during the Notice of Preparation comment period (see Appendix C). The following traffic and parking impact analysis is therefore provided in response to both the Initial Study determination and the comment letters from MTA and Caltrans.

The Sierra Hotel project will involve customer and luggage drop-off and pick-up at the Bay Street curb cut-out location, with customer vehicles taken to the Pike parking garage across the street (southwest corner of Cedar Avenue and Seaside Way). Vehicle parking in this garage could be performed by either hotel patrons or valets.

#### Traffic Operations Impacts

As shown on Table 7 of the Traffic and Parking Impact Study (page 20), the Sierra Hotel project is expected to generate 65 AM peak hour trips (38 in and 27 out) and 70 PM peak hour trips (42 in and 28 out) with a total of 814 daily trips.

Based on City of Long Beach Traffic Impact Guidelines, a traffic impact is considered significant when the resulting Level of Service (LOS) with project traffic is E or F and project related traffic contributes a volume/capacity of 0.02 or more to critical movements.

The results of a Year 2007 With-Project Traffic Conditions analysis concludes that only two study area intersections would operate at LOS E or F (see Table 8, page 23). These are the same two intersections (3<sup>rd</sup> Street/Daisy Avenue and Ocean Boulevard/Shoreline Drive) identified under the Year 2007 No-Project Traffic Conditions analysis. More importantly, as shown on Table 8, the LOS level would not change from the 2007 No-Project Traffic Conditions LOS levels and the project would not increase the 2007 volume/capacity ratio to the 0.02 threshold of significance. There would be no volume/capacity ration increase for the AM peak hour at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street/Daisy Avenue intersection. The Ocean Boulevard/Shoreline Drive intersection would experience only a 0.002 volume/capacity increase (well below the 0.02 threshold) for both the AM and PM peak hours.

Therefore, in accordance with the City's threshold of significance criteria, the proposed project would not have any significant impacts on the surrounding study area intersections.

#### Current Parking Impacts

As previously stated, parking for the Pike is provided at three locations. The seven level, 2,211 space Pike parking garage (which includes a small surface lot along the south side of the garage), the 124 space valet lot located south of

Shoreline Drive to accommodate adjacent restaurants, and a 370 space employee parking lot located west of the Queensway Bridge on the south side of Shoreline Drive. These three Pike parking areas therefore provide a total of 2,705 spaces. The Aquarium parking garage and public parking lots adjacent to Shoreline Village are not included in the Pike parking supply.

For hotel land uses, the City's Zoning Code requires one parking space per guest room, plus two loading and unloading spaces. In addition, there are separate Zoning Code parking requirements for banquet rooms, meeting rooms, restaurant and gift shop accessory land uses within hotels. The only accessory land use proposed for this hotel would be a 1,352 square foot meeting room on the first floor, which has a parking requirement of one space per every 50 square feet of floor area. Therefore, if the Sierra Hotel was proposed as a separate, stand-alone project, it would have a total parking requirement of 169 spaces (140 spaces for the hotel rooms, two loading/unloading spaces, and 27 spaces for the meeting room). However, the Sierra Hotel project is part of the overall Pike at Rainbow Harbor development and will utilize the existing parking supply provided for all Pike land uses.

The seven level, 2,211 space Pike parking garage is at present considerably underutilized. As discussed above, the Pike parking garage operator, Ace Parking, reports that the garage is relatively empty during daytime hours and about one-quarter occupied on Friday and Saturday evenings. Although several of the nearby land uses expected to utilize this garage were either not yet developed or fully occupied at the time of the parking survey (December 2004), even a doubling of current demand levels would provide substantial unused parking capacity. Therefore, the code required parking for the Sierra hotel can be easily accommodated in the Pike garage under current conditions.

#### Future Parking Impacts

A shared parking demand study was previously conducted for the original Queensway Bay development by Linscott, Law & Greenspan (see Appendix E of the 1994 EIR). Pages 24 through 31 of the Traffic and Parking Impact Study in Appendix G of this Supplemental EIR provides an updated study of future shared parking demands on existing Pike parking supplies.

As part of the March 2005 Traffic and Parking Impact Study, a shared parking analysis was conducted to determine if the existing Pike parking facilities could accommodate the proposed Sierra Hotel project and future Pike growth. This parking analysis was based on the full buildout and occupancy of the Pike using the land uses listed in Table 9 (pages 26 and 27) and the site plan illustrated in Figure 10 (pages 28 and 29) of this Study. This shared parking analysis assumes that multiple land uses have a shared parking supply and the complimentary parking demands of the different land uses allow the same parking spaces to be shared by these different uses. Shared parking studies can

be conducted using the City's parking code requirements or other measured or derived parking rates.

Share parking demands for future uses were based both on the City's Zoning Code parking requirements by land use type and the latest parking generation rates published by the ITE Parking Generation, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, 2004. Table 10 on page 30 of this Study shows both parking demand rates. The ITE rates are based on sample surveys taken at multiple facilities and measures actual occupancy rather than required parking supply (as set forth in the City's Zoning Code). In addition, a parking analysis was also performed using the City parking requirement for a shopping center of five spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area for all land uses (except detached fast food restaurant pads). The Pike was classified and approved as a shopping center by the City. Since this shopping center parking requirement already factors in shared parking assumptions for multiple shopping center tenants by applying a single parking rate for all land uses, no additional shared parking methodology was included in this approach.

Using these rates at projected full Pike buildout, the peak numbers of required parking spaces for each land use type were calculated and these estimates were used as input values for the parking analysis. The City parking code includes a "buffer" amount of about 15 percent, which accounts for the difference between the functional capacity of a parking facility and its physical capacity. Typically, a parking facility is considered to reach its functional capacity when about 85 to 90 percent of the parking spaces are occupied. The ITE values are typically based on actual occupied spaces and do not include this buffer amount. Parking demands were therefore calculated at both 85 percent occupancy and 100 percent capacity.

Parking demand by Zoning Code requirements for individual land uses is provided in Table 11 (page 31), which estimated total adjusted shared demand at 2,633 spaces. Based on ITE recommended rates, as shown in Table 12 on page 32, total adjusted shared parking demand would be 2,242 spaces. Parking demand using the shopping center parking requirement shown in Table 13 (page 32) totals 1,926 spaces. All three approaches assume the absolute peak parking demand for each Pike land use were to occur at the same time.

The peak parking demands in Tables 11 and 12 were then adjusted to account for non-auto trips to and from the Pike (walking and transit use) as well as for multi-purpose trips. Transit and walking percentages were obtained from previous City downtown parking survey data conducted by the Long Beach Redevelopment Agency and Downtown Long Beach Associates in 2001. Shared/multi-purpose trips take into consideration that some people will stop at multiple locations within the Pike during a single trip (i.e., dinner and a movie). This results in only one parking space being used for more than one land use and no parking is required after the first trip destination. For retail uses, this discount was assumed to be about 25 percent even though the percentage of

secondary attractors (smaller development sites) is about 40 percent of the total retail uses. This assumes that the smaller sites are secondary stops on a person's trip and would not generate parking demand beyond employee demand. The discount for walking and transit use was about five percent for each trip mode. Therefore, a total discount (including transit and walking) of 35 percent was used for the retail uses.

Similar, but smaller, parking demand reductions were assumed for the theater, restaurant, and nightclub uses. For the hotel, some shuttle and taxi use is expected, but no discounts on parking demand were taken to develop a more conservative parking demand estimate. After application of all these parking reductions, the number of multi-purpose trips from various Pike uses was balanced against each other to verify that the number of multi-purpose trips, and subsequently parked cars, would be balanced and linked between the various land uses.

Peak parking demand occurs at different times for different land uses on different days. In addition, the level of demand as a percentage of the peak also varies by hour during the day. Assigning the percentage of demand in relation to the peak demand for each hour provides the parking demand distribution for a particular land use. Table 14 (page 34) lists the distributions for both a weekday and a Saturday for the various Pike land uses (based on the definition of land uses, the distribution for restaurant and nightclub uses were treated as the same land use).

Multiplying the gross parking demands listed in Tables 11 and 12 by the hourly distributions shown in Table 14 provided the hourly shared parking demand for the entire Pike development on both a weekday and a Saturday. The weekday and weekend demand estimates based on the City parking code requirements for various land use types are listed in Table 15 (page 34) and Table 16 (page 35). Weekday and weekend demand estimates using the ITE rates are provided in Table 17 (page 35) and Table 18 (page 36).

A summary of the analysis shows that the parking demand using the City parking code rates produces a result that would include a 15 percent buffer of additional spaces to account for functional capacity. The 100 percent capacity peak demand for parking based on the City code requirements would be 2,567 spaces (see Table 15). Peak demand at 100 percent capacity using the ITE rates would be 2,580 spaces (see Table 17). Peak demand at 100 percent capacity using the City parking code requirement for shopping centers would be 1,926 spaces (see Table 13). The peak demands at both 85 percent occupancy (functional capacity) and 100 percent full capacity are provided below in Table 4.6-1 (based on the breakdown shown in page 36 of this Traffic and Parking Impact Study):

**Table 4.6-1 Future Peak Demand**

	<u>City Rates</u>	<u>ITE Rates</u>	<u>Shopping Center Rate</u>
Weekday: 85 Percent Occupancy	2,182	2,193	n/a
100 Percent Capacity	2,567	2,580	1,926
Weekend: 85 Percent Occupancy	2,073	2,097	n/a
100 Percent Capacity	2,439	2,467	1,926

As shown above, the City code rates for individual types of land uses and the ITE rates produce very similar projected parking demand. The demand based on the shopping center code requirement produces a result about 550 spaces less than the other two approaches. Based on the land use mix in the Pike, versus a typical shopping center which is the basis for the single code parking requirement, the higher parking demand would likely be a more appropriate estimate of future parking demand for the Pike at full buildout. Therefore, total future parking demand is projected at less than 2,600 spaces. Since 2,705 spaces are currently provided at the three Pike locations (2,211 space parking garage, 124 space valet lot, and 370 space employee lot), the conclusion of this parking analysis is that there would be adequate Pike parking supply available to accommodate all Pike land uses at full buildout. The parking supply analyzed does not include the Aquarium parking garage or the public parking lots adjacent to Shoreline Village.

#### Localized Transportation Improvements

Based on the conclusions of the Traffic and Parking Impact Study, there are no identified significant project-related impacts at any of the study area intersections and therefore no new traffic system improvements are required.

As part of the Sierra Hotel project, the existing curb along the project frontage on Bay Street will be modified to accommodate the customer drop-off/pick-up area. This cutout area will allow several vehicles to load and unload along the hotel frontage. No on-street parking will be allowed along this Bay Street frontage.

#### Regional Transportation Improvements

The statewide Congestion Management Program (CMP), implemented locally by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), requires that the traffic impacts of development projects with regional significance must be analyzed for the CMP system of selected arterials and all freeways. A total of 164 intersections are identified for monitoring on this system in Los Angeles

County. The threshold for significance for CMP analysis are 50 directional trips at a CMP intersection and 150 directional trips on a CMP freeway segment.

Out of the total 164 Countywide CMP arterial monitoring locations, only the Ocean Boulevard/Alamitos Avenue and 7<sup>th</sup> Street/Alamitos Avenue intersections are in the project study area. The Traffic and Parking Impact Study determined that the project will generate less than 50 trips at either intersection and therefore no CMP intersection analysis is required. In addition, the Sierra Hotel project would not contribute more than 18 trips to the nearest I-710 Freeway segment (south of Anaheim Street) during any peak hour period and therefore no CMP impact analysis is warranted (see Table 19, page 39 of the Traffic Study).

#### **4.6.3 Mitigation Measures**

No significant impacts would result from the Sierra Hotel project and therefore no mitigation measures are recommended.



## **SECTION 5.0**

### **SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

This Section identifies all potentially significant unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the Sierra Hotel project as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b).

Based on the environmental analysis provided in Sections 4.0 through 4.6 of this Supplemental EIR, the Sierra Hotel project would result in no new significant unavoidable adverse impacts. All potentially significant impacts resulting from the construction or operation of this proposed land use that can be mitigated to a less than significant level. The Sierra Hotel project represents a small component of the overall Pike at Rainbow Harbor, which was subject to environmental review under EIR 13-94 and ND 5-98. Full build-out of the Pike at Rainbow Harbor will result in a smaller scale project than the original Queensway Bay Master Plan summarized in Tables 3.0-1 and 3.0-2 of EIR 13-94, and since the hotel land use would not create any new unavoidable adverse impacts, the Sierra Hotel project would not exceed any significance levels identified in the original EIR.

EIR 13-94 identifies all significant unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the entire original Queensway Bay project, specifically for Land Use (pages 6.2-27 and 28), Air Quality (page 6.6-26), Traffic (page 6.7-52), and Visual Resources (page 6.14-4).

No unavoidable adverse impacts were identified in EIR 13-94 for Population/Housing (page 6.3-8), Earth (page 6.4-18), Hydrology (page 6.5-21), Biological Resources (page 6.8-2), Hazards/Risk Management (page 6.9-1), Noise (page 6.10-7), Public Services, Pages 6.11-2, 4, 5, and 6), Utilities (page 6.12-4, 8, 10, 13, 15 and 20), Energy (6.13-4), Cultural Resources (page 6.15-7), and Recreational Resources (page 6.16-13).

No new significant unavoidable impacts were identified in ND 5-98 for the reduced project. The Sierra Hotel project is a small component of this reduced project and no new significant unavoidable adverse impacts were identified in this Supplemental EIR. Therefore, no further CEQA review of unavoidable adverse impacts is necessary.

## **SECTION 6.0 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES**

This Section identifies the irretrievable commitments of nonrenewable resources through project implementation in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c). Construction of the proposed Sierra Hotel project would require the commitment of materials such as wood, concrete, asphalt and other building materials typically used in the construction of hotel land uses. There would be an irretrievable commitment of energy resources such as gasoline and diesel fuel for the operation of construction equipment during project construction activities. Since these types of resources are available in sufficient quantities in the Long Beach area and the Sierra Hotel project construction will be for limited time duration, the commitment of these types of resources for project construction is not considered to be an adverse impact. As documented for the original Queensway Bay Master Plan project, EIR 13-94 also noted that impacts from the consumption of fossil fuels and construction materials would be adverse but not significant (page 9.0-1).

Project operations will result in the long-term consumption demands on water and public utility service systems. However, these demands are regionally small in nature and there are sufficient quantities of these resources to adequately accommodate demands from hotel operations and therefore is not anticipated to result in an adverse long-term impact related to the commitment of resources. In addition, EIR 13-94 acknowledged on page 9.0-1 that while the urban harbor will serve as a permanent feature, land uses and structures are not irreversible permanent commitments. Therefore, since no significant adverse impacts are anticipated by hotel construction or operational activities, no further CEQA analysis is required.

## **SECTION 7.0 GROWTH INDUCING AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

### **7.1 Growth-Inducing Impacts**

The analysis of growth-inducing impacts is provided in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d), which requires a discussion of the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. A discussion is also required on project characteristics which could encourage or facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulative.

The Sierra Hotel project represents a small component of the overall Pike at Rainbow Harbor development, which is a scaled down version of the original Queensway Bay Master Plan project analyzed by EIR 13-94. As stated on page 7.0-3 of EIR 13-94, the proposed project is specifically geared to promote economic growth and will have the effect of accelerating growth of the retail, office and hotel uses and bookings of the convention center, and therefore under CEQA is considered growth-inducing.

Full development of the Pike at Rainbow Harbor with the Sierra Hotel project will result in a smaller version of the original Queensway Bay project, with substantially less office and hotel uses than reviewed under EIR 13-94. The Sierra Hotel project will not create any new significant growth-inducing impacts and therefore no further CEQA analysis of potential growth-inducing impacts under this Supplemental EIR is necessary.

### **7.2 Cumulative Impacts**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 requires a discussion of a proposed project's cumulative impacts where the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(a)(3) defines "cumulatively considerable" as incremental project effects that are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

Since the Sierra Hotel project is a small component of a scaled down version of the original Queensway Bay Master Plan project, there would be no cumulative impacts resulting from this proposed hotel land use that have not already been fully analyzed in EIR 13-94. These cumulative impacts are found to be beneficial for Land Use (page 6.2-27), Biological Resources (page 6.8-2), and Visual Resources (page 6.14-4). Less than significant adverse cumulative impacts

were identified in EIR 13-94 for Population/Housing (page 6.3-7), Earth (page 6.4-18), Hydrology (page 6.5-21), Hazards/Risk Management (page 6.9-1), Noise (page 6.10-7), Public Services (pages 6.11-2, 4, and 6), Utilities (pages 6.12-4, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 20), Energy (page 6.13-4), Cultural Resources (page 6.15-7), and Recreation Resources (page 6.16-13).

While Air Quality was found to be an unavoidable significant adverse impact, EIR 13-94 notes that the SCAQMD does not address control requirements for cumulative and adjacent areas (page 6.6-26). Unavoidable adverse Traffic impacts discussed on page 6.7-52.

While no new significant cumulatively considerable impacts would result from the proposed Sierra Hotel project, the following list of downtown projects is provided for informational purposes.

**TABLE 7-1  
MAJOR DOWNTOWN PROJECTS**

<u>Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Status</u>
201 The Promenade	162 room hotel	Entitlements final
300 W. Ocean Blvd	538 rental units (Camden Phase I)	Complete
400 W. Ocean	246 condo units (Camden Phase II)	Under construction
CitiPlace	470,00 sq. ft. commercial, 290 rental units	Complete
517 E. 1 <sup>st</sup> St	69 unit hotel	Under construction
350 E. Ocean Blvd	556 condo units	Under construction
248 Broadway	48 rental units and commercial	Preliminary
201 E. Broadway	11 condo conversion units	Under construction
200 E. Broadway	62 condo units	Preliminary
640 Long Beach Blvd	Walgreen's store	under construction
200 Long Beach Blvd	Artist complex	Preliminary

**TABLE 7-1 (continued)**  
**MAJOR DOWNTOWN PROJECTS**

<u>Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Status</u>
133 The Promenade	83 rental units	Preliminary
433 Pine Ave	Condo conversion	Preliminary
600 W. Broadway	334 condo units, 14,000 sq. ft. commercial	Preliminary
745 W. 3 <sup>rd</sup> St	64 senior housing units	Entitlements final
230 W. 3 <sup>rd</sup> St	80 condo units	Preliminary
427 W. 6 <sup>th</sup> St	10 rental units	Preliminary
125 Linden Ave	30 condo units	Preliminary
250 Pacific Ave	142 condo conversion units	Entitlements final
150 W. Ocean Blvd	216 condo units (Camden III)	Preliminary
210 E. 3 <sup>rd</sup> St	96 rental units, 11,200 sq. ft. commercial	Preliminary
Broadway between Chestnut Ave and Maine Ave	508 rental units, 345 condo units, 15,000 sq. ft. commercial (West Gateway)	Entitlements filed

## **SECTION 8.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, or to the location of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of such alternatives. The intent of this requirement is to consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR need not consider infeasible project alternatives. The range of potential project alternatives is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice and examine in detail only those alternatives that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic project objectives and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the project. The EIR should also identify any alternatives considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and discuss the reasons underlying that determination.

The range of alternatives must pass a feasibility test pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1), which states that among the factors to be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictions boundaries, and whether the project proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to an alternative project site location.

A “No-Project” Alternative shall be one of the alternatives evaluated under this requirement but is not to be the baseline for determining whether the proposed project’s potential environmental impacts may be significant. If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The factors used to determine feasible project alternatives involve the basic objectives established for this project, the identification of potential significant impacts from the project, and possible land uses for the project site.

The 1994 EIR considered the following alternatives to the Queensway Bay Master Plan:

- Alternative 1: No Project
- Alternative 2: Original Plan
- Alternative 3: Relocate Harbor to Downtown Marina
- Alternative 4: Mother’s Beach in Lagoon
- Alternative 5: Alternative Mitigation
- Alternative 6: Alternative Marina Breakwater

All six alternative were thoroughly analyzed in Section 8.0 of the 1994 EIR, which concluded that besides the No Project Alternative, the project as proposed at that time was the result of Alternative 2 and was designed to mitigate the impacts of that alternative (Alternative 2 was rejected because of significant impacts to the Queen Mary, the Marine Berth and Shoreline Park). The proposed project was therefore considered the environmentally superior alternative in addition to the No Project Alternative (page 8.0-40).

Since the Sierra Hotel project represents a land use change to a small component of the overall Pike at Rainbow Harbor commercial and entertainment complex, which is a reduced size project from the original Queensway Bay project analyzed on the 1994 EIR, no further Alternatives analysis for this Supplemental EIR is necessary.

#### Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative

Under this alternative, the project site would remain vacant and undeveloped. This alternative would have no new environmental impacts since no development, construction or land uses would occur on the project site.

This alternative does not meet the City's goals and objectives for this site as set forth in the original project EIR (EIR No. E-13-94). Specifically, no development of the project site does not complete development of the downtown waterfront in a manner which is supportive of the downtown redevelopment project area, does not generate revenue to the City and downtown redevelopment project area, does not generate additional employment opportunities in the downtown, and does not make full utilization of a presently vacant and unproductive site possible. Consequently, this alternative is rejected since it does not meet basic objectives established for this project or allow for possible productive land uses for the project site.

#### Alternative 2: Original Project Land Use Alternative

The original land use proposal analyzed by EIR No. E-13-94 for the T1 Tidelands portion of the entire project development (originally known as the Queensway Bay project, now known as the Pike at Rainbow Harbor) proposed a 300 room hotel. The proposed project would provide for a 140 room hotel, less than half the number of rooms under the original project proposal. While this alternative meets the City's goals and objectives for the project site land uses, the environmental impacts in terms of traffic and air quality associated with a 300 room hotel would be substantially greater than the project as proposed. Consequently, this alternative is rejected as environmentally inferior to the proposed project.



## **SECTION 9.0 CONTACTS, PREPARERS AND REFERENCES**

### **City of Long Beach**

Angela Reynolds, Environmental and Advance Planning Officer  
Craig Chalfant, Project Manager  
Lemuel Hawkins, Project Planner  
Jerome Olivera, Project Air Quality Analyst

### **LodgeWorks**

Christopher Gebert, Project Applicant

### **Jeff Krehbiel Associates**

Jeff Krehbiel, Project Architect

### **Meyer, Mohaddes Associates**

Robert Olson, Project Traffic Consultant

## **REFERENCES**

Environmental Impact Report, Queensway Bay Master Plan, EIR No. 13-94, State Clearinghouse No. 94081033, certified December 19, 1994

Subsequent Environmental Review, Mitigated Negative Declaration, Queensway Bay, ND 5-98, certified April 2, 1998

Long Beach General Plan: Land Use Element, 1989; Air Quality Element, 1996

Long Beach Zoning Ordinance, PD-6 (Downtown Shoreline Planned Development District)

Long Beach Local Coastal Program, 1980

South Coast Air Quality Management District, URBEMSIS Model 2002

City of Long Beach/California State Lands Commission Queensway Bay Exchange Agreement, May 22, 2002

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, VERTEX Engineering Services, Inc., July 23, 2004

Phase II Subsurface Investigation, VERTEX Environmental Services, Inc., August 26, 2004

Sierra Hotel and Suites, Traffic and Parking Impact Study, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, January 2005

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Regional Activities, Growth Forecasting, 2004 Regional Transportation Plan Growth Forecast

Developers Diversified Realty, Project Data, March 2005

Environmental Impact Report, The Park at Harbour View, EIR No. 20-00, State Clearinghouse No. 20000061108, certified November 2, 2000